

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XX.—JULY, 1895.—No. 79.

THE RUSSIAN STATE CHURCH.

THE accession of the youthful Nicholas II. to the throne of Russia was marked by some unwonted displays of friendly feeling towards his Catholic subjects. A deputation of Polish notables was admitted to the coronation ceremonies and received with marked consideration by the Czar and his wife, though it had first been forbidden to attend by the Russian Governor of Warsaw, General Gourko. The last-named official was shortly afterwards withdrawn from his office, and as he had always shown himself a bitter opponent both of Polish nationality and of Catholicity, his retirement was taken as an earnest of a more liberal régime for Poland. The young emperor, in one of his early proclamations, declared that he would make no distinction between his subjects on account of their faith. It is not safe to augur definitely of a young ruler's career from his first acts as master; but still, those words of Nicholas II. inspired hopes that the persecution now going on in Lithuania, and which culminated two years ago in the massacre of Krosche, would be relaxed or ended.

Almost simultaneously with the death of the late Czar, the Sovereign Pontiff had adopted a vigorous line of action for the restoration of the separated Christian bodies of the Eastern World to Catholic unity. Though this action was primarily directed towards the Greek Armenian and Syrian Churches, its success could not fail to have considerable effect in the religious affairs of Russia. The Russian people attached to the State Church is by much the largest body of schismatic Christians now in the world. Though its church is wholly independent of the Greek Church, governed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, it is at one with it in doctrine

and religious practice. Russia only separated from Rome in obedience to Constantinople's action, and if the latter were to return to obedience, why should not Russia likewise? There is certainly no valid reason from a religious point; but, unfortunately, temporal interests are now, as they have been always, the chief cause for the continuance of the schism between the east and west. However, the conjuncture of the new Czar's liberal utterances with the action of Leo XIII. has excited strong hopes of reunion in many sanguine minds outside of Russia. What grounds for such hopes really exist, is what these pages propose to discuss.

A good example of the feelings entertained on this subject by many Catholics not familiar with Russian affairs is furnished by an article which appeared in the French magazine, "*La Revue des Deux Mondes*," at the beginning of this year. The writer, who appears to be both zealous and fairly acquainted with theology and church history, takes a favorable view of the prospects of reunion. He dwells on the religious evils of schism as recognized by Catholics and schismatics alike in the abstract, and urges that the present Sovereign Pontiff has proved his anxiety to remove all cause of fear that the national usages in points of discipline and language would be disturbed by the return of Russia to Catholic unity. He magnifies a few expressions of the Procurator-General of the Schismatic Church in favor of peace into evidence of a desire on the part of a large number of the Russian clergy to unite with the Church under the headship of the Roman Pontiff. Father Vanutelli, an Italian Dominican priest and brother of a cardinal who paid a somewhat lengthened visit to Russia about two years ago and published a rose-colored account of that country, is quoted by the writer in the "*Revue*" in corroboration of his own optimistic hopes.

In those hopes all Catholics must sympathize and pray that they may be realized. The union of a hundred millions of Christians to the body of the Church, could it really be accomplished, would be a moral gain for mankind such as has been never paralleled since the days of Constantine. Before, however, we allow ourselves to be carried away by the brilliancy of such a prospect, it is all-important to know what are its actual prospects of realization; otherwise, we are in serious danger, not merely of deluding ourselves with airy day-dreams, but we may be led into alliance with the foes of the Church in inflicting the deepest injury upon her and a large body of her children. While seeking to conciliate schismatics, we may become unwitting tools of hypocritical persecutors of the Faith. Such results have happened more than once in the history of Russia's dealings with the Holy See, and it needs the prudence of the serpent, not less than the spotless innocence

of the dove, before we can decide whether there is danger of their repetition at the present time.

The relations actually existing between the Russian government and the Catholic Church are so different from those of other countries as to be scarcely understood by the great majority even of well-instructed Catholics outside of Russia. The general opinion may be pretty fairly stated thus: The bulk of the Russians are Catholic in faith but schismatic in refusing to own the Pope's authority. The Catholic subjects of the Czar have full toleration, and the government protects their clergy and worship by its laws. Such, we believe, is the common opinion of American or French or Italian Catholics; but, unfortunately, as the Catholics of Russia itself know too well, such is very far indeed from being the fact. From the days of Peter the Great until the present time the Russian government has been in name tolerant of the Catholic Church and respectful towards its head. From the time, however, when Catherine II. first obtained dominion over a Catholic population by the partition of Poland, the Russian *régime*, except under Alexander I., has ever been one of actual persecution towards its Catholic subjects.

When Catherine first seized on a large part of Poland, that country contained a population estimated at nearly five millions of Catholics following the old Slavonic rites, but as effectually united to the Roman pontiff as any other part of his flock. One of the first acts of the empress was to promise full religious liberty to both Latin and Uniat Catholics; but this declaration was quickly followed by the forcible enrollment of nearly half the Uniats in the State Church and the banishment of their faithful clergy. A repetition of similar measures, not without much bloodshed, under Nicholas and his successors has completely wiped out of existence the whole body of Uniat Catholics in Russia. For them there is no longer even the flimsy pretence of religious liberty. They must be schismatics in outward appearance or leave their country. The massacre at Kroze, in Lithuania, little over two years ago, is a warning of the nature of the toleration which Russia extends to her Catholic subjects at present. It is absolutely needful to use the greatest caution in giving a ready ear to friendly words from the men who are responsible for such deeds, if we would not expose ourselves to the risk of being dupes instead of apostles.

Russian history furnishes only too many examples of the readiness of her rulers to utilize the zeal of Catholics for her own political ends. Ivan the Terrible, the half-savage czar who played such an atrocious part in Russia in the sixteenth century, professed his anxiety for a reconciliation with the sovereign pontiff

when his armies had been scattered by the Catholic king of Poland, Stephen Batory. No sooner had peace been obtained, however, than the negotiations for union were cynically abandoned. In our century, Nicholas used a Papal circular, garbled from its real meaning, as an effective weapon for suppressing the Uniat Catholic dioceses of Lithuania and forcing nearly two millions of Catholics into the official church of the empire. There is a very serious danger that the enthusiasm of well-meaning Catholics unacquainted with the policy of the empire may be used as a means of crushing out the resistance which is now being offered to the extinction of Catholicity in Russia instead of restoring it to the communion of the Church.

A brief description of the Schismatic Russian Church as it exists to-day may enable us to judge how far the hopes of its speedy reconciliation are well grounded. The majority of American and European Catholics have rather vague ideas of the nature of a formal schism. There have been in America and Ireland a few cases of schism on a small scale. It has at times happened that a priest has refused to submit to the ordinary authority of his bishop and the Church on some personal quarrel, and that his congregation, while calling themselves Catholics, have followed his personal guidance against the general law; but such occurrences have been always ended, at the latest, with the life of the rebellious pastor or by his formal secession from the faith.

The case is very different in the eastern world, where personal quarrels of churchmen have taken a national character in opposition to the unity of the common faith of mankind. The eastern leaders of revolt were not simple priests, but patriarchs having power to perpetuate their action by the creation of other bishops among their followers. The Greek schism, of which the existing schism in Russia is an offshoot, began with the personal ambition of a patriarch of Constantinople in the eleventh century. Michael Cerularius found the supreme authority of the Roman pontiff, which had been recognized by his predecessors, inconvenient to his own ambition, and he separated the bishops and clergy under his authority from the rest of the Church under pretext of some minor points of discipline in which the practices of the east and west differed. The emperors supported the schism from political motives, and the Byzantine Greeks, who had come to regard themselves as the only people retaining fully the old Roman civilization, accepted the separation with little reluctance. They still acknowledged in theory that the Church and its faith was one, and the Greek patriarchs never claimed any headship over any but the eastern Christians. But the policy of the emperors and the national prejudices of the Byzantine people were stronger mo-

tives than loyalty to the Church, and they perpetuated the schism. It continued as a dispute which should be some time settled by a general council; but as the Roman pontiff's authority was rejected, there was no human means of holding such a council in the minds of the Byzantine patriarchs.

Russia, when the unity of the Church was broken, was a newly-converted nation. It had received Christianity chiefly from Greek missionaries, and its church discipline was that of the Eastern Church. Its liturgy and church language were neither Latin nor Greek. The latter was old Sclavonian, and the former had been established in Moravia two centuries before by Sts. Cyril and Methodius, both Greeks, and approved of by Pope Nicholas. Russia, in the eleventh century, scarcely occupied a fifth part of the present European dominions of the Czars, and was almost entirely separated from intercourse with Western Europe. Its capital was Kief, where the Scandinavian warrior, Rurik, had founded a kingdom among the Sclavonian tribes of the steppes along the Dnieper and Don. The north of the present Russia was occupied by the Lithuanians and Finns, who were still pagans, and the south by various Turkish and Tartar tribes, Chazars, Huns, and Bulgarians. Vladimir, the first Christian monarch of Russia, had brought Greek monks and priests to convert and civilize his people, and when Constantinople separated from Catholic unity, Russia almost unconsciously followed in the same course. For nearly three centuries, however, there was scarcely any formal rejection of the authority of the Holy See. The Russian primate or metropolitan appointed the bishops of his country on his own authority, and received his own authority from the patriarch of Constantinople, as had been the rule before the schism. Catholic missionaries, like St. Hyacinth in the thirteenth century, were freely received, but the difference of rites kept the still half-civilized Russians closely connected with the schismatic patriarchs of Constantinople.

The conquest of Russia, in the early part of the thirteenth century, by the Mahometan Mongols isolated its people almost completely from intercourse with the western Christian nations. Kief and the territory around it, which had become comparatively civilized, suffered the most, and various princes divided the country into principalities tributary to the Tartar Khans, who had their residence near the great wall of China. One dynasty of those princes established itself in the northern forests around the present Moscow, among the Finnish populations, and gradually built up the Grand Duchy of Muscovy, from which the modern Russian empire has grown. The Tartar dominion over Russia lasted two centuries, and under it the government and customs of the Chris-

tian Russians acquired a character almost wholly Asiatic and despotic. The supremacy of the monarch over the Church became firmly established during this period. In the Byzantine empire, after the schism, the Patriarch was appointed or confirmed by the Emperor, and the Russian Czars readily adopted a system which suited so well with absolutism in politics. Within a few years after the Muscovite grand dukes had become independent of the Tartars, a Czar, Vassili III., gave a striking illustration of the fact. The Greek Patriarch was reconciled with the Church in 1452, at the Council of Florence, and Isidor, the metropolitan of Kief, followed his example. Vassili, however, refused to accept union, and drove the metropolitan out of his dominions. It was Russia's first formal act of voluntary schism, and its motive was not religious but political. It is the same motive which has, ever since, kept the Russian people apart from the Catholic Church.

The grand dukes of Muscovy in the fifteenth century, however, were not the rulers of the entire Russian people. Several large provinces, including Kief itself, the metropolitan see of the Russian Church, had been recovered from the Tartars by the Dukes of Lithuania, while the rulers of Moscow were still subject to the Mongols. The Russian, or as it came to be called, Ruthenian, population of these provinces was jealous of its national liturgy, but it did not relapse fully into schism. The union with the Catholic Church, effected at the Council of Florence, was not definitely rejected, but the Ruthenian metropolitan continued to receive his institution from Constantinople. The rise of Protestantism in the next century, and its rapid growth for a time in Poland, prevented a thorough union of the Ruthenians of the Slavonic rite with the Roman See. The czars of Muscovy contributed to that end by appeals to national prejudices, but finally, in 1594, a synod held at Brzest formally renewed the act of union with Rome. A few nobles and part of the clergy refused any communion with the Latin Church, but the great body of the nation accepted it, and the Holy See, on its part guaranteed the preservation of the Slavonic liturgy and usages to the Uniat Catholics. The union has only been broken by the despotic will of the Russian autocrats after the conquest of Poland, but it existed in fact for over two centuries, and is still maintained in Austrian Poland.

In the dominions of the Russian czars any attempt at a union of the church with Rome was jealously forbidden. The monarchs claimed absolute authority in spiritual affairs as well as in temporal. For a time the Patriarch of Constantinople was regarded as the chief authority in the Russian Church, but in 1589 the Czar Theodor purchased from the Patriarch the creation of a Patriarchate of Moscow, subject to his own direct appointment. Though

the Russian Patriarch was a subject of the czars and absolutely dependent on their will, the office was found too important for the absolute rulers of the State to endure. Peter the Great in 1719, on the death of its holder, made a remarkable change in the government of the Russian Church. A mixed board of bishops and lay officers appointed by the czar was established under the name of Holy Synod, and to it was given absolute control over the religious practices and belief of the Russian people. As the emperor appoints and removes the members of the synod at pleasure, he is virtually, though not in name, the supreme head of the church in Russia.

It is hard for an ordinary Catholic not acquainted with Russian life to comprehend how this absolute dominion of the head of the state influences all the practices of religion in the Russian Church. Its episcopacy does not teach that the czar is infallible or that the duties of a Christian towards God are not paramount to all others, but it does, however, inconsistently teach that in civil and religious affairs alike the will of the emperor is the supreme law for his subjects. That any Catholic could accept such teaching is, of course, impossible, and until it is abandoned by the Russian people it is simply impossible for them to become real members of the Catholic Church.

A sketch of a few of the difficulties which a Catholic subject of the czar finds in the actual practice of Catholic daily life will illustrate the wide gulf which separates Catholicity from the schismatic church of Russia. Such a man, if born of Catholic parents, is allowed to profess his faith openly in virtue solely of the toleration which it pleases the government to grant him. If, however, either of his parents, or even one of his ancestors, has ever belonged to the schismatic church he must attend its worship and frequent its sacraments under pain of exile. Even if such is not the case, a Catholic may not openly express dissent from any doctrine sanctioned by the emperor, or communicate his own belief to a member of the state church. He may not join with his fellows in any association, even for purely religious or moral ends, without the police sanction. A temperance society, an Association for the Propagation of the Faith, or a League of the Apostleship of Prayer, all these are criminal societies in the eye of Russian law. He may only receive the sacraments of the Church from the priest and in the church specially designated for him by the police. If for any whim of a provincial governor the Catholic Church is closed in a country parish, the members of its congregation must remain without worship or sacraments in many cases. They may not travel beyond the bounds of their district without special permission, and in many places priests are strictly forbidden to confess, baptize,

or administer any sacrament, even in case of death, to any one not inscribed in their own parochial registers. Police permission is required before a Catholic may devote himself to the priesthood or to a religious life. If he marry a member of the state church, he loses all legal right even to instruct his children in his own faith. If he needs religious advice or instruction on points of his own faith or conduct, he may not, under heavy penalty, whether layman, priest, or bishop, seek it from any authority outside Russia, except by official permission. All communication, even on purely religious matters, with Rome, must be submitted to police inspection, and can only be forwarded through the Russian ministry. Under such circumstances a Russian Catholic forms a much clearer idea of the difference between the official Christianity of Russia and the faith of the Catholic world than is possessed by his fellow Catholics of other lands.

The external difference in forms of worship and ritual, though they would impress a foreigner strongly, are appreciated at only their just value by a Russian Catholic. The use of Slavonian instead of Latin in the Mass, the marriages of the priests, the absence of organs and other instruments from the interior of the churches, the jealous exclusion of statuary from them, while pictures enclosed in metal relief frames are everywhere displayed for veneration, are, as he knows well, matters of local usage, which in themselves are compatible with the practices of the Catholic Church.

He finds, however, other points in the practice and teachings of the State Church which are directly opposed to the Catholic faith. Divorce is sanctioned by the Holy Synod, and when it is a question of the Emperor's will it may be granted for any conceivable cause. The administration of the sacraments and the very days on which communion must be received are prescribed, not by episcopal authority, but by an imperial ukase. Questions of doctrine, such as justification by faith alone, or the necessity of baptism by immersion, are decided in the same summary manner as matters of State policy. Everywhere in the most sacred practices of religion the supremacy of the Emperor over the human conscience is proclaimed or displayed. In the ritual the names of every member of the Russian imperial family are printed in special type, even larger than that of the Almighty, and when those names are read or chanted, every orthodox worshiper must bow the head. The State Church, as a teaching body, only claims to repeat the decrees of the Emperor. On stated occasions solemn anathema is pronounced against false believers and the foes of holy Russia. Arius, who denied our Lord's divinity, is coupled in a common condemnation with the Czar whose dynasty was overthrown by the Romanoffs, and with Mazeppa, the Cossack chief, who made war on

Peter the Great. The actual schism of which this strange political religion is the result, may, indeed, have been based on errors or prejudices of small moment in the mind of any reasonable man, but it is very different with the question of the imperial supremacy in everything, which is the real cardinal dogma of the present Russian Church.

It may be asked why a Church which retains most of the essential Catholic doctrines, and which has shown itself ready to bend to every will of its sovereign, might not be brought back to Catholic unity by the simple will of its head. We would answer, that powers based on false principles cannot avail for good ends. Great as is the personal power of the Russian Emperor, he is only a part in the vast administrative machine which constitutes the Russian government, and which, receiving its impulse from Peter the Great, its actual founder, has never wavered from its policy for two centuries. That policy is essentially the fusion of all the races within the Empire, Russian, Finnish, Polish, Tartar, Armenian, or German, into a common nationality, obeying implicitly the commands of an autocrat, and ready to extend his dominions constantly and indefinitely over other races and lands. For that end, the Russification of the Empire, a State religion has been recognized as a most important instrument by Russian rulers, and the control of that religion is regarded as essential to their own autocracy. Hence comes the hostility to the Catholic Church which the imperial government has shown since the days of Peter, with only the partial exception of Alexander I. A religion which is above the control of the Emperor is not compatible with complete absolutism, and absolutism is the central idea of the present Russian government.

Absolute power in the hands of any human being is, however, impossible. It may be set up by legal theory and scientific craft of policy, but it is always limited by human weakness. There are few more striking passages in history than those in which the Roman historian describes the end of Tiberius Cæsar, the lord of the Roman world. His word ruled the life of every Roman citizen, even from his sick bed; but when a momentary faint made his attendants believe him dead, they hastened to proclaim his successor. The old despot suddenly revived, and began to issue his orders. The spell of submission was not broken, and the courtier crowd for a few moments were ready to obey, but a single reckless soldier threw a cushion over his master's face, and all was over. Russian Emperors have before now met the fate of Tiberius Cæsar. Peter, the husband of Catherine, and Paul, in the present century, were quickly removed from existence by a handful of men without even disturbing the general course of a despotic system. The fate

of Alexander II. is another instance of the dangers which surround an autocrat, even in Russia to-day.

Is there any strong probability that the present Czar will show courage enough, even if he have the will, to undertake the reconciliation of Russia with Catholic unity? We will frankly say we have seen nothing so far in his conduct to warrant a belief in it. After the first utterances of his reign, he appears to have resigned himself to following the policy of his late father's counsellors. The administrators whose hostility towards Catholicity was especially marked during the late reign, have all, except Gourko, been continued at their posts, and received flattering commendation from the new sovereign. Pobiedonosteff, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, and virtual chief of the Church administration, has apparently been securely established in power. The same has been the case with General Orzewski, the Governor of Wilna and Klingenberg, whose barbarities in Kroze, less than three years ago, could only be paralleled by those lately committed in Armenia. Even Gourko, whose removal from the governorship of Warsaw was hailed with such joy by the Catholics of Poland, has been complimented by an imperial rescript, in which his measures for the Russification of that country are warmly approved by the present Czar.

Actual measures of persecution have not been wanting in Poland and Lithuania during the few months of the reign of Nicholas II. No later than last January, eighteen Catholic priests were arrested in the diocese of Lublin on the charge of administering the sacraments of the Church to Uniat Catholics, who asked for them, though officially enrolled in the state church. Only a month before, five country women of the village of Minoga, in the diocese of Kielce, were transported to distant parts of Russia for the offence of being enrolled in the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart. Finally, Nicholas II. has, within a few weeks after his accession, signed a decree by which no less than twenty-four Catholic priests, including the rector and vice-rector of the Diocesan Seminary of Kielce, in Poland, were sentenced to transportation, three to Siberia and the others to distant provinces of Russia.

This last case had begun before the death of Alexander III., but its execution is the act of his successor, now reigning. The charge against the twenty-four priests was understood to be that of having entered into an association among themselves while students at the Seminary of St. Petersburg, and also of having in their possession Catholic books not approved by the Russian censorship. They were tried in the Citadel of Warsaw by a military commission, whose proceedings were kept secret, the decrees of

punishment only being published. The facts, as given in the Polish papers, are simply these: In the early part of 1893 the police suddenly descended by night on the Seminary of Kielce without any warning and seized the papers and books both of the professors and students. Among them were found some copies of the magazine, "Apostleship of the Sacred Heart," well known to most Catholic readers, and devoid of any political purpose. There were also found some copies of an agreement, drawn up some years before by a number of Catholic students at the ecclesiastical seminary of St. Petersburg, who agreed to assist one another during their career with advice and aid in case of necessity, and to resist to the utmost of their power any attempt at perverting to the State Church Catholics under their pastoral charge. Such is the simple duty, of course, of every Catholic priest; but though Russia tolerates the Church in theory, her government has no idea of allowing Catholic duties to be carried into practice if against the will of the police authorities. So the seminary of a whole diocese, having a larger Catholic population than the State of New York, has been closed, and twenty-four priests of stainless character sent to consort with the vilest criminals as an explanation of the meaning of the young czar's first words of good will.

While the reunion of the Russian people to the Catholic Church is to be earnestly desired by every Catholic, we cannot see any special reason for expecting it from the new czar's policy. As Cardinal Newman once said of the conversion of England, it is with probabilities, not possibilities, that we have to deal in actual life. Despotism in government and schism in religion are so intimately allied in Russia that both must stand or fall together. Before her people can openly draw nearer to the Catholic Church, as some millions who are only schismatics in name only ask opportunity to do, it must be free to them to assert their choice in matters of religion. Before the Russian government can take any steps towards entering the Catholic Church, it must cease to persecute Catholics as such. The acts of Nicholas II., not his words, are, unfortunately, evidence that the era of persecution has not ended with the life of his father.

B. CLINCH.

PURE *vs.* DILUTED CATHOLICISM.

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD has said that in his opinion, "the Christianity of the future will be the form of Catholicism."¹ He did not mean genuine, pure Catholicism, but a sort of æsthetic ghost escaped from its dead body and surviving as a kind of separate spirit, that can embody itself anew, as a transformed Catholicism, which will be substituted for its own old form, and for all Protestant sects, after they are dead and buried. Dr. Barry, commenting on Mr. Arnold's statement, says that we all, Catholics and non-catholics alike, have a deep interest in the question: "Is a transformed Catholicism possible?" Of course, he answers the question in the negative.

A great many, who retain and hold much more of Christianity than Mr. Arnold did, have a notion somewhat similar to his. They have a desire for some sort of unity among Christians who are now so much divided, a unity in which the Catholic Church, and the Eastern churches will be included. They profess to believe, some less and others more, of the Catholic Creed; a portion of them, having drawn very near to the full Catholic doctrine.

Their notion of the way to bring about the formation of the new Universal Church of the future is one which requires a great many concessions and transformations on all sides. Even the Roman Church, to which they have very generally been obliged to grant a considerable pre-eminence, and which must play the principal part in this Christian re-union, they require and expect to make concessions, and to sanction a very considerable transformation of Catholicism into Neo-Catholicism. This is all chimerical. When the question is asked: "What can the Roman Church surrender as not essential to her truth and authority?" every Catholic must answer: Nothing whatever pertaining to her dogma and her substantial polity. Truth can make no compromise with error; authority can waive none of her divine rights which are necessary to the perpetuity and well being of the Church. The Roman Church can surrender none of her Creeds, from the Symbol of the Apostles to that of Pius IV. None of the Ecumenical Councils, from Nicea to the Vatican. None of the dogmatic decrees *ex cathedra*, of the Sovereign Pontiffs. None of the seven sacraments. No part of the Papal Supremacy, or episcopal

¹ See the article, "Dogma and Symbolism," *Catholic World*, April, 1888.

superiority. Not one single portion of the Canonical Scriptures. Not her Liturgy or Ritual, her independence from the State, or her moral code; and, above all things, not the infallibility of the Catholic Episcopate in its assembled or dispersed members, and its supreme head; and its claim on the loyal allegiance of all baptized Christians.

What is left, then, for the Roman Church to surrender? In respect to truth, the term "surrender" is inadmissible. The truth which she has once proclaimed, she can never disavow. The utmost that she can concede is by abstaining, for a time, or altogether, from declaring and defining, with a final and obligatory judgment, which she has power to issue, but wisely postpones or withholds, what is the truth, implicitly or virtually contained in the Divine revelation committed to her. Her authority to determine what is in itself of faith, and to teach this truth, no one can limit. She cannot surrender any part of this authority, or concede liberty to hold and teach any error in faith. But she may refrain from exercising all her authority, and leave schools and private doctors in their liberty of opinion and discussion, respecting many questions, which have not been adjudicated, and are therefore open. We may call this a concession to liberty, especially in cases, when at a later period, freedom of discussion has been closed by a definition, but also, though not so surely, when matters which appear to be definable, are still left undefined. When, however, the data for a definition seem to be wanting, it is more exact to say, that there is a recognition of the liberty which is in possession. Moreover, in respect to matters which are moral, the Roman Church can and does recognize the existence of a liberty *de jure divino*, with which she has no right to interfere, because she has neither given it, nor can take it away.

From all this it appears, that practically the question respecting surrender or concession in matters of dogma cannot be entertained by the Roman Church, in relation to any division of Christians calling itself a church.

At the Council of Florence, the Latin and Greek theologians discussed fully all doctrinal questions on which there was supposed to be a difference, the chief of which was the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son. On every point, the doctrine of the Roman Church was formulated, and the tradition of the Greek Church prior to the schism begun by Photius, and consummated by Michael Cerularius was proved to be in agreement with it; especially on the two cardinal points of the Procession and the Primacy. The Pope, who presided over the Council, gave way in nothing. The Greek Emperor and prelates agreed to everything, signed the decrees, and were reconciled to the Roman Church.

The only concession was: that they were not required to insert the clause "*Filioque*" into the Creed of Constantinople, although they were required to accept the dogma.

In the time of Luther, there were several very serious efforts made to reconcile the Protestants to the Church, and to draw up a formula which they would be willing to sign, and which could be accepted as an orthodox confession. It was proposed that a general Council should be held, at which the reforming party should have representatives to plead their cause. But all these projects fell through. All this occurred before the Council of Trent was held, and when some of the doctrines in controversy had not been clearly and finally adjudicated. At last, this great Council was begun, and after many sessions continuing during sixteen years, it was happily concluded. A series of magnificent dogmatic decrees was ratified and promulgated, upon which Catholic theology was solidly established for all time. The Holy See has since added to the definition of Trent the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and the Vatican Council has promulgated its Dogmatic Constitutions.

The definitions of the Church are final and irreformable. There they are; there is the Catholic faith. There is no room for reconsideration, compromise, or concession. All bodies or individuals wishing to be united to the Roman Church must confess this faith, pure and simple, whole and entire, as the *sine qua non* of reconciliation. There are many devout Protestants who are willing to join in Catholic worship, who would even wish to receive communion if it were allowed, and perhaps to make more or less of a confession. Still, they are not ready to leave the sect to which they belong, and by no means prepared for an unconditional submission to the authority of the Catholic Church. They are a kind of liberal Christians, with very hazy notions about dogmatic truths, and holding as an axiom that all forms of Christianity are essentially the same. Some of those who write and preach about reunion appear to think that the Holy Father, in his affectionate invitation to all whose ancestors wandered away from his fold, means to assure them that they will be welcome as they are to come into a merely external union with the Church, without any inward conviction and belief that the Catholic Church is the only true Church, and all her doctrines true and obligatory.

Of course, no properly instructed Catholic can entertain or encourage any such notions as these. Every Catholic, who has even an elementary knowledge of the principles and doctrines of his religion, must be aware that in order to be lawfully admitted to the sacraments, and entitled to receive baptism, absolution, confirmation, and holy communion, the subject must believe in his

heart, and confess with his mouth, the whole Catholic faith, pure, simple, and undiluted.

Above all others, those who undertake to persuade non-Catholics to embrace the Catholic religion, and for this end explain its doctrines, answer objections, and strive to remove impediments to faith, must clearly understand and correctly state all which the Church teaches and requires her children to believe, without subtracting or diminishing anything. We cannot suspect any of the advocates of Catholicism who have written for this purpose of any intention to make a compromise of any part of the faith. It is indeed impossible for a Catholic to advance anything plainly and openly heretical, and still maintain his ground as a sincere and loyal son of the Church. Nevertheless, it is possible to make explanations of dogmas and definitions which dilute their genuine and real sense, or in some way are indirectly subversive of their authority. Some writers of good repute have fallen into mistakes of this kind. With a laudable desire to smooth the way into the Church by removing scientific or historical difficulties, they have strayed more or less from the safe path upon dangerous and untenable ground, and have incurred reproof or admonition from ecclesiastical authority. There have been instances of contumacious resistance to this authority, ending in open rebellion and a lapse into heresy; for example, De Lammenais and Döllinger. But, happily, such cases are rare exceptions at the present time. Generally, those who have been engaged in the important and laudable work of advancing Catholic science in that intermediate domain which lies between the divine revelation and the whole territory of rational knowledge, and proving the harmony between them, have been animated by a loyal and docile spirit toward the supreme authority in the Church. Consequently, they have been ready to correct their aberrations when the paternal voice of the Holy Father has pointed out where they have gone astray.

The temptation to dilute Catholic doctrine springs from the desire to make it appear reasonable and to facilitate the return of wanderers to the true fold. But it is a great error to suppose that it can be made more acceptable to them in this way. Their great obstacle is the prejudice arising from misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the genuine Catholic doctrine. There are many, however, whose prejudice is against the pure Catholic doctrine itself. There is but one course open to the Catholic apologist in arguing with either of these two classes. It is, to make a frank and clear exposition of Catholicism, as it really is, and to marshal the evidences and proofs of its truth. If this suffices to convince the inquirer, well and good. If not, the advocate can do no

more, and he must leave his cause to rest on its own merits. But, in any case, diluting the doctrine will serve no purpose. Those who give their attention to the subject wish to know what the Church teaches, fully and completely, and not what private persons teach, as a sort of modified and improved version of her genuine, unadulterated doctrine. The attempt to pass off any kind of diluted Catholicism for the genuine article is sure to fail. For it must always, sooner or later, become manifest that the Church disowns and disavows every such undertaking. Besides, what gain would it be if a crowd of half-Catholics were taken into the external communion of the Church. Conversion must be thorough in order to be of any avail. Happily, the conversions which have brought a strong and valuable reinforcement to the Catholic ranks during the last half-century have been thorough, if there have been some superficial converts who have relapsed into heresy.

The danger of a repetition of the attempts of Jansenists, and the so-called "Old Catholics" of Germany to adulterate the pure Catholic doctrine, if it exists, is remote. If it is in any way diluted it can only be by advancing opinions on topics which are supposed to be left open to free investigation and discussion, which opinions cannot be made to combine with the dogmas of faith without a weakening effect. Beyond the line of explicit definitions there is a region of theology, where it comes into relations with philosophy, history and the sciences. It is on this common ground that investigation and discussion in which Christian and Catholic principles and doctrines are involved, find their field and scope at the present time. Nothing can be more noble or useful than this great work of Apologetics, though it is an arduous task. It is an effort to make a synthesis of all branches of knowledge, divine and human, to show their relations and harmonies, to remove their apparent discrepancies, and to accomplish a perfect demonstration and vindication of Christianity, *i.e.*, of Catholicism which is identical with it on all sides and in every department of human thought. The mistakes which even with their best intentions and efforts some laborers in this field have made, and to which human frailty is always liable, afford no reason for discouragement or the relaxation of effort, but only for prudence and solicitous care to avoid temerarious theories.

It is, however, necessary, in order to preserve the Catholic doctrine in its genuine purity, not merely to abstain from diluting it with alien and weakening elements; to avoid all diminution by concessions; but also to guard against the opposite danger of adding to it by amplification, straining the simple and literal sense of its definitions beyond their proper import. The censure pronounced

against some error may be extended beyond its intention, so as to strike an innocent proposition. The affirmation of some positive truth may be made to include inferences, conclusions, concepts which are distinct and separable from it. The proposition which is innocent in the sense of not being condemned, may be, nevertheless, open to dispute or denial. And the conclusions referred to may be more or less probable or true. But the judgment pronounced is one of private authority, and not the sentence of the Church. There are many things held and taught quite commonly, or at least, by some prevalent school in the Church, which do not pertain to Catholic faith or doctrine. There is much generally believed by the faithful which transcends the limits of the explicit and obligatory teaching of the Church. Now preachers and writers cannot restrict themselves to statements of dogma. They must throw their concepts into fuller forms and express them in popular language. It is very easy for the preacher or writer, in doing this, to interweave something of his own into the warp and woof of the Catholic doctrine he is explaining. It is not easy to avoid it, even if one tries to do so. Now, we do not mean to assert, that the exposition of Catholicism in sermons or in writings ought to be restricted to a bare and exclusive presentation of Catholic faith as defined by Popes and Councils. But only this; that where the object is to instruct Catholics or non-Catholics respecting that which must be believed as a condition of receiving the sacraments and as necessary to salvation, the private teacher should take care not to impose, on his own or any other human authority, more than the Church imposes. The region which the Church leaves open to freedom and difference of opinion must be respected, and the right of the individual believer to hold any probable opinion with a safe conscience. Often times it is not easy to determine, in respect to certain opinions, which have a character of novelty and have not yet been thoroughly discussed, whether they are really probable and tenable or not. In this case it is more prudent and commendable for private authors, if they are personally convinced that such opinions are erroneous or temerarious, to avoid forestalling the judgment of the ecclesiastical tribunal by positive and severe censures upon those who advance them, especially if they enjoy a good Catholic reputation. Opinions which are now universally regarded as tenable, even as very probable, or certain, had to gain ground at first by tentative efforts against grievous suspicions and strong opposition; as for instance, the heliocentric theory and some tenets of the Jesuit school. In these days many Catholics find difficulties in the way of faith, and sincere non-Catholics are similarly impeded in their search for religious and divine truth. Charity requires that the utmost care,

consideration, and tenderness should be shown to these perplexed inquirers, and every effort made to relieve them of their difficulties and make the path of truth clear before them. The satisfaction of rounding off a system, drawing logical conclusions, gaining a polemical victory, and making a fine rhetorical display is nothing at all when it is a question of promoting the peace, welfare, and salvation of souls. By all means, let argument and persuasion have full play, but not so as to bring undue weight of authority to bear on the conscience, and to increase the burden which must be sustained by faith.

There have been works published which have exaggerated some Catholic doctrines in an imprudent manner, some, even, which have had a detrimental influence, and have given occasion to adversaries to misrepresent and injure the cause of Catholicism.

By all means let us present the pure and undiluted Catholicism before the minds of men without any watering and weakening, but also distinct from a merely human theology, which is not the bread and milk suited for the nourishment of the children of the family.

Theology of the right sort is, nevertheless, one of the most imperative wants of the intelligent laity. An English theology for the laity has been hitherto a desideratum. Germans have for some time been provided with many most excellent and solid works in their vernacular. At last there is a promise of similar works in English, emanating from the indefatigable Jesuit Fathers. It is to be hoped that the theology in English which is in course of publication will supply the long-felt want in a satisfactory manner. The first and most imperative need is to give the laity a clear and exact statement of the *credenda* of the Catholic religion, of the dogmas pertaining to the Catholic faith, and all the doctrine proclaimed as infallibly certain by the supreme authority of the Holy See. Beyond, and in connection with this instruction in the faith, there is the whole field of rational philosophy and scientific theology—from the first and fundamental truth of the existence of God, the First and Final Cause and Creator, to the ultimate problems of the destiny of man and the universe. Every part of this domain is full of dangerous and subtle forms of heresy and infidelity lying in wait to ensnare the faithful, especially the studious youth, which must be combated and refuted.

The tide of popular science has been strongly against Christianity. Happily, it is now beginning to turn and set the other way. And now is the time for Catholic advocates to take advantage of this change. The popular mind is hungering and thirsting for wholesome intellectual food and drink. If we are wise and faithful, we will exert ourselves to furnish an abundant supply for this demand.

We think enough has been said in proof of the maxim that it is not "transformed Catholicism" which will meet this demand, but the pure, undiluted article, supplemented and supported by sound science.

Beside doctrine, there is also all that complex order of organic life, embracing government, worship, legislation, customs, practical religion and morals, which may be called by the common name of discipline.

Doctrine, considered as truth, is, of its own nature, immutable, not subject to control or alteration by law and authority. It is otherwise with discipline. There is an eternal law in the moral order which, being founded in the essential truth of things, is not dependent even on the will of God, but equally unchangeable with necessary truth. But there is a positive law, depending on the will of God as supreme legislator and on the will of the lawgiver to whom he has delegated power and authority, which admits of variation and is susceptible of change, within due limitations, by the action of authority, either divine or human. The Catholic discipline is in part of direct, divine institution, depending solely on the divine will, and above all direction from the will of man. The Unity and corporate Constitution of the Church, the Seven Sacraments, the Sacrifice, the Priesthood, the Episcopate, the Papacy, the Law of Monogamy and indissoluble Marriage, are of divine institution and above all human control. There are, in addition to these, institutions, laws, traditions, apostolic or ecclesiastical, proceeding from the will of human legislators, depending on this human authority and capable of variations, modifications, alterations in different times, countries and circumstances.

There is a wide difference, however, between the question, whether, in certain cases, the supreme power in the Church is absolutely competent to make a change in the discipline, and the question whether it can do so rightfully, wisely, prudently and usefully. The Pope has the absolute power to abolish the institution of metropolitans. Yet it would be a great abuse of power to attempt such an innovation. As an instance to the contrary, we may cite the case of priests in China being allowed to wear their caps during the celebration of Mass and the consecration, contrary to the universal rule requiring them to remain uncovered, out of reverence to the Blessed Sacrament. In China it is a mark of respect to cover the head in presence of dignitaries, and considered as very disrespectful to stand before them uncovered. Hence, it is wise to conform to that custom when ministering at the altar, and would be very foolish to do otherwise.

Some persons may fancy that there are many matters of discipline in which the Roman Church might make concessions to the

spirit of the age—to modern ideas and customs—in the same way and on the same principle that an exterior rule about wearing a biretum at the altar could be changed out of deference to a national custom. It is evident, however, without going into particulars, that any general plan of a transformation of Catholic discipline to suit the spirit of the age and the notions and habits of some particular countries and classes of persons, is equally fallacious and visionary with a scheme of doctrinal transformation. The great number of Protestants who are longing to return to the bosom of the Roman Church, through some sort of compromise, dream and scheme of some such transformation of discipline, though it is in the vaguest and most general way. Some Catholics may be caught by a similar illusion, through their zealous and charitable desirable to facilitate the return of these separated brethren. There is no doubt that the Church has always shown a flexible character of adaptability to different times and peoples, and that in matters not belonging to essential and substantial discipline there have been and are marked variations in the forms of external Catholic order. But all these things are and must be under the control of the rulers of the Church, and not subject to innovation and experiment from the caprice of individuals.

The measures lately taken by the Holy See in reference to the Eastern Churches have brought the differences existing between the Oriental and Latin rites into a quite general notice. It is quite likely that there is some common misapprehension of the attitude of the Holy See toward these Eastern Christians, as if there were a concession of the rights of the Roman Church; as if a new policy were inaugurated; but this is really not the case. What the Pope has really done is to reaffirm more distinctly and emphatically the assurance previously given by several of his predecessors, that the Holy See has no intention or desire to Latinize the Eastern rites. To those who are little acquainted with the past history of the ancient Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and of that Byzantine Patriarchate which afterwards dominated over them and became first a rival and then an enemy of Rome, the great differences in ecclesiastical discipline between the East and the West may seem to be startling. Powers and privileges were granted to these Patriarchs which were not conceded to Western primates. They had their own liturgies, rituals and breviaries, in Greek and several other languages, with peculiar vestments, ceremonies and customs. Communion under both species was allowed to the laity. Married men could be ordained deacons and priests. The Eastern discipline was ancient and in part derived from apostolic times. In respect to the law of the celibacy of the clergy it was a deflection and a degeneracy from the more perfect rule fol-

lowed in the West, the effect of which was in great measure counteracted by the religious orders, the elevation of only celibate priests to the episcopate, and the prohibition of marriage after ordination. The existence of a married clergy in the East is a defect but not a moral disorder. And the Holy See continues to allow it, as it has done heretofore, even in the united churches. It would be very wrong to say that any dishonor attaches to Catholic priests of the Eastern rites, who are married men, although it is most desirable to fill up the ranks of their clergy, so far as can be prudently done, with young men who voluntarily assume the obligation of celibacy at their ordination. Even in Russia many of the young men destined for the ranks of the White Clergy wish to win this privilege which is denied them by the imperial law. The sanction of the Eastern discipline is not, as appears from what has been said, an approbation or concession of innovations upon ancient laws and customs. It is a protection against innovation; against every attempt to substitute the Latin for the Greek and other Oriental rites. Latin missionaries have sometimes adopted in past times a Latinizing policy very obnoxious to the traditional spirit of the Easterns. During the Crusades, the national antipathy of Greeks and Latins was very much embittered. A Latin empire and patriarchate were established by the Crusaders at Constantinople, which lasted for about seventy years. This was probably a most serious and unfortunate blunder. Whatever other mistakes have been made in the efforts to bring the Easterns back to unity, Leo XIII. has most distinctly and emphatically forbidden all attempts to Latinize them, and has guaranteed the protection of the Holy See to their ancient rites, customs and discipline.

There is nothing like a Protestant or Puritan spirit among these Eastern Christians, except it may be a few who have been seduced from their allegiance by Protestant missionaries. Their religion is only another phase of Catholicism; and if, on some one day, they could be all reconciled to the Roman Church, and they went to Mass and Vespers as usual on the Sunday after, they would not perceive any visible change or difference which had been wrought in the interval. Nestorians and Monophysites would be required to abjure their respective errors in faith, which would perhaps cause some corrections to be made in their liturgical books. The Greeks have only to abjure their schism and submit to the Roman Primacy.

Some of the amateur Catholics among our neighboring sects would very likely wish to see the Latin discipline modified in accordance with that of the Eastern rites in order to make their own reconciliation easier. If they could be united in their corporate capacity, retaining their hierarchy, ministry, rites and customs,

they would be very glad. But it is too late for such a consummation. The English Church and nation were reconciled in a body by Cardinal Pole. But they fell away again into a deeper abyss. In common with all the other Protestants of the world, they are without an episcopate, a priesthood, or any other attributes of a church. They are a mere collection of individuals who, at the best, are only baptized Christians, wandering in strange pastures beyond the fold of the true Church of which they are *de jure* members. The question of Anglican orders is really and finally settled, and it is certain that they will never be acknowledged. Every Catholic who has been an Anglican minister must rejoice that the English Church lost the sacrament of order when he remembers what he has seen of the irreverence with which the bread and wine of the communion have been treated, even though this irreverence has in great measure ceased, through the spread of a higher doctrine. I can remember how the crumbs of the communion bread were scattered about and swept up; how at conventions the clergy would consume what was left of the elements, as if they were taking a lunch, chatting freely together; how the wine, remaining after communion of the sick, was tossed out of the window, and after a general communion in a parish church, poured back into the demijohn for use on the next occasion. It is a great relief to the feelings to reflect that it is only bread and wine which have been so unceremoniously handled, and that the Lord has not left his sacred body and blood in the hands of any of the numerous bands of the Protestant clergy.

Those Protestant clergymen who imbibe Catholic doctrines and sympathies, especially when they have misgivings of their safety, and long for union with the Church, are surely in a difficult and painful position, when they are married men. They have to make heroic sacrifices in order to obey their conscience. Some have had severe trials and sufferings to encounter in the effort to find a secular career wherein they could support their families. Many have not had the courage to face the consequences of giving up their ministry. They are entitled to our profoundest sympathy, and to every possible help which can be extended to them, to remove or alleviate the difficulties of their situation. These are disastrous consequences of the crime of Luther and Cranmer in revolting against the Church of God. Happy are those who, being free from the bonds of matrimony, have the way to the priesthood open to them, and those who have an opportunity of going into some profession where they can be successful. Many converts from the ministry in England and America have been thus fortunate. But not thus is the case with all, who either take the decisive step, or would do so, if they saw the path clear before

them. As the number of these increases, the case becomes more perplexing, and the obstacles in the way of conversion more unmanageable.

As it is, each one must come singly to be received as a catechumen, and then into lay communion, even though he were a bishop. After that, he must cast himself on the Providence of God and struggle for his existence as best he can. It is quite natural that this class of men should wish that they might be ordained, and ask why the Eastern discipline should not be allowed, in certain cases, within the Latin Rite. Those who dream of a corporate reunion of the Church of England to the Roman Church are prone to imagine that the bishops, rectors, clergy, and people might all be reconciled in a mass, and everything go on as before, in the same way that it would do in Russia, if the Church of the Empire were reconciled to Rome.

Suppose this extraordinary event to occur, would the Holy See consent to have all the English clergy ordained, and go on living in their parsonages with their wives and families, as Catholic pastors, like the white clergy in Russia?

It is utterly useless to ask this question, since there is not the faintest sign that such a visionary prospect will ever be realized. It is hardly possible that any sane person exists so completely carried away by his imagination as to dream of its accomplishment.

There are, indeed, some who dream of something not less inconceivable. And this is, of an Ecumenical Council of Roman, Greek, and Anglican prelates, in which the Pope will resign all but an honorary primacy, and a transformed Catholicism burst forth to astonish and subdue the world.

What is to become of the great mass of Protestantism in the coming centuries, who can foresee? It seems to be like the vast Chinese Empire, destined to go to pieces. According to present appearances, a multitude of its adherents will lapse into infidelity and irreligion, and the remainder be absorbed into the Catholic Church. The Church will continue in her unity, and, it is to be hoped, will increase, flourish, and eventually triumph. But the Providence of God alone can control the destinies of the nations which once composed Christendom, and accomplish the prophecies concerning the kingdom of Christ, in ways known only to himself. They are beyond all human plans, efforts, and foresight.

We must follow the advice of the Archangel Gabriel to the Prophet Daniel: "Go thou thy way, until the time appointed."¹ We must take things as they are, and do the duty which lies before

¹ Dan. xii., 13.

us. We must first take care of the people whom God has given us, the faithful, to instruct and guide them in the way of salvation. We must also preach the gospel to those who are without, and endeavor to bring them into the way of salvation. From the multitude who are standing outside the vineyard, we must gather in as many as we can, to labor in it for their salvation, and to partake of its fruits.

This is an arduous work, and beset with many difficulties. There are obstacles in the way of those to whom we bring our message and invitation, even when they are sincere, upright, and disposed to listen to the preaching of Catholic truth. The fundamental difficulty consists in the chasm which has been made between the Church and the multitude whose ancestors abandoned her communion. The Protestant revolt was a renunciation of the doctrine and discipline of Catholicism, followed by the construction of new systems of doctrine and discipline, out of some Christian elements which the reformers carried with them. Their animosity against the Catholic Church has caused them to misrepresent and calumniate the religion which they abandoned. The separation of three centuries has produced such an estrangement, that Catholicism appears like an institution totally alien from all their conceptions of Christianity. It is an arduous task to retrace their way back to the Church of their fathers. In many cases, if, through the influence of divine grace, they tread this upward, rough, and difficult path, they have to encounter opposition, and sometimes persecution from their families and former associates. Those who remained faithful to their old religion in the days of Henry, Edward, Elizabeth and their successors, had to suffer many things, often even death. The converts who have been coming back to the Church, from the sixteenth century until now, have in many cases had to undergo more or less persecution and to make sacrifices. The early Christians had to face the probability of martyrdom as the price of their profession of the faith. At present, there is generally much less danger of undergoing any very severe suffering as the consequence of embracing the faith, and it is always becoming less as the common prejudices are diminishing. Indeed, it would be unjust to refrain from acknowledging that converts often receive only the kindest and most considerate treatment from relatives and other friends.

When it is otherwise, we can only encourage them by setting before their minds those motives which induced the martyrs of old to give up all, even life, for Christ and the faith. Namely, that the priceless worth of the grace of God is far beyond the cost of any sacrifice, however great.

These trials from without are not, by any means, the only or

chief difficulty in the way of conversion to the Catholic Church, for the multitude to whom we extend the invitation to enter her sacred portals.

It is the internal difficulty of ignorance of the true nature of Catholicism, the prejudice coming from early education, the reluctance to embrace what seems to be a new and strange religion.

The one and only way to meet and surmount this difficulty and obstacle, is to set forth before their minds the truth and beauty of the Catholic religion, as the apostles did to the people of the Roman Empire, to whom they preached Christ and His religion. This is not a simple and easy affair. It involves the employment of means and measures, of many kinds and in great number. The great task incumbent on us, is to present before this great multitude surrounding us, the Catholic Church and religion, as the one true Church and religion of Jesus Christ, in whom they in general believe as the Lord and Saviour of the world. To set before them the evidence that this is indeed the Christianity of the apostles, of the martyr ages, of the Holy Scriptures which they reverence as the word of God. Though there are some, whose prejudice and animosity are directed against Catholicism as it really is, because of the positive heresies which they hold in a distinct and understanding manner, like the first heresiarchs and apostates who were leaders and disciples of the Lutheran Reformation, it is not to these that we can address our invitations with much hope of success. There is a much larger number, who do not hold firmly and with understanding to the specific doctrines of the old sectarian formulas, and who are therefore open to conviction. Moreover, some Catholic doctrines have gained a hold on the minds of a considerable number not only of the English Church and its American daughter, but also of members of other communions. Outside of the body of communicants in the Protestant denominations, there is a multitude, practically without any definite religious convictions, or habits of religious observance. Here lies the great field, white for the harvest, the missionary ground where zealous labor promises abundant harvests.

The great work before American priests is the conversion of as large a portion as possible of the American people. It is therefore a momentous practical problem, how to present the Catholic Church before them in the best manner, so as to manifest its truth and beauty, to convince their minds and win their hearts. What special means and measures can be adopted, to spread knowledge and to reach the consciences of men, in whom reason and the moral sense must cry loudly or faintly for a religion which can satisfy both the intellect and the heart?

The most efficacious of all these means, is good example, piety

and virtue shining forth in the lives of the clergy and laity as the good fruit showing the quality of the tree that bears it, the power of Catholic faith and discipline to produce Christian sanctity, which is one of the notes of the Church. The greatest obstacle to the fulfilment of the divine mission of the Church has always been the sins of her members, especially of unworthy ecclesiastics. The relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline and the consequent loss of respect for the priesthood was one of the principal causes of the miseries and disorders of the sixteenth century. In the true and genuine reformation brought about by the Council of Trent, the restoration of discipline gave back to the religious orders and to the clergy the lustre which had been dimmed and obscured; they recovered their influence and power over the people; many illustrious saints and apostolic men appeared, new orders were founded, especially the illustrious Society of Jesus, and in consequence there was a wide and thorough reformation of morals and revival of piety among the people in all the countries which remained Catholic, and effectual barriers placed to further inroads of heresy and schism.

The honor of the Catholic religion has been chiefly lodged in the hands of the clergy. The world looks chiefly to them as the representatives of the religion which they teach, the models of the moral virtues which they inculcate, the practical exemplification of the high ideal standard and rule of conduct which Christianity proposes. When priests are holy, the world sees what is the true spirit of the Catholic religion. And they never stand alone. They are always surrounded by faithful disciples, who follow their instructions and imitate their example. The effect of the scandal given by the wicked is counteracted. It is not the existence of sins and sinners which furnishes an argument against the truth and sanctity of the Catholic religion. Men do not condemn the legal, medical and mercantile professions, the institution of the family, the constitution of the State, because there are unprincipled men, swindlers, bad parents and children, worthless and criminal citizens. These instances prove nothing, unless the principles and the moral influence of these associations are proved to be the cause of the moral delinquencies of their members, a supposition which is absurd.

The Catholic Church is vituperated, Christianity is vituperated, all religion is vituperated, because their enemies unjustly impute evils and miseries which exist in spite of them, to them as their cause and source. For the same reason, God is blasphemed as being the author of evil, and the whole order of his divine providence in the world, political and social, is denounced as a universal law.

The worst of all the atrocious calumnies against the Catholic Church is that which accuses her of teaching and practicing demoralizing principles.

The Order of the Temple was attacked and destroyed by Philip the Fair on the ground that it had become an organized institute of impiety and vice. Opinions differ on the question whether the accusation was just or unjust. That there were disorders and many bad members in the order is certain and admitted by all historians. This would have been a reason for strict measures of reformation, but not for the abolition of the order, if it still remained sound as a corporate body. But the war on it was not based on a charge of partial and individual delinquencies. It was accused of having become utterly corrupt in head and heart, a systematic destroyer of the religion and virtue of the young knights and novices, a school of impiety and immorality. We express no opinion of the truth or falsity of the charge. But, supposing it to be true, we have here an example of a society in which depraved members were not merely wicked because they were unworthy and bad Templars, but because they were simply Templars, their badness the effect of the evil principles governing the body itself and showing themselves in the corruption of individual members. If this were so, of course, the destruction of the order by Philip the Fair, who was sustained by the decree of Clement V., was just and imperatively necessary, although in carrying out his purpose Philip sought to fulfil his own base and selfish ends and was guilty of great cruelty.

There is another signal instance of a great and powerful society accused of being an embodiment of wicked principles for evil ends and persecuted to destruction, viz.: the Society of Jesus. In this case we know that the accusation was not only groundless but absolutely contrary to the real truth of the facts. It is a matter of astonishment to any one who reads the true history of this illustrious order and then contrasts with it the unparalleled calumnies of its enemies that both can have co-existed and that malice and credulity could have reached such an extreme.

The fanatical hatred of the Society of Jesus and the persecution carried on against it by the most wicked rulers who have cursed Europe since the days of Diocletian were not directed against the order as their ultimate goal but against the Catholic Church and the Holy See. Those who have inherited this spirit of animosity and who still believe and repeat the atrocious calumnies of the unscrupulous anti-Catholic and infidel writers of the last century regard the Society of Jesus as the most perfect embodiment of the spirit of Catholicism, which they nick-name Romanism—a spirit which they regard as a wicked spirit. No one who has not

been brought up in the atmosphere of that dark and appalling tradition respecting Rome and the Catholic Church can fully appreciate what it has been, and still partially continues to exist, in the minds of the ignorant and prejudiced. Belief in the worst calumnies has to a great extent passed away among the enlightened and educated. Yet we have seen these dreadful and most absurd fables repeated within the past year by fanatics and gaining more credence with the ignorant multitude than we could have believed possible.

It certainly seems extraordinary that the true church and genuine religion of Jesus Christ should become a victim to such black calumnies and implacable hatred among a people calling itself Christian, whose ancestors were converted by Roman missionaries and professed the Catholic religion. We ask, how could God permit it? His counsels we cannot penetrate. But when we look back we perceive that he has permitted stranger things than these of a similar kind. The Lord himself was accused of being in league with Satan and was condemned to an ignominious death. His apostles and a host of his followers incurred the same condemnation. The early Christians were overwhelmed by a flood of the vilest calumnies, accused of the basest and most atrocious crimes, notwithstanding their innocence and their heroic virtues. The Lord forewarned them that the world would hate them, as it had hated him. What wonder, then, that the same fate should befall the successors of the apostles and the offspring of the martyrs.

It is the totally false and monstrous idea of Catholicism in the Protestant tradition, so far as it still retains possession of the Protestant mind, which is the principal obstacle to the preaching of the Catholic religion so as to gain a fair hearing. Therefore, the first work to be done is to remove this obstacle.

It is not difficult to expose the lies which have gained currency under the name of history and to substitute true history in their place, although it is a somewhat laborious task. Modern non-Catholic authors have done a large part of this work for us already. Numerous and excellent Catholic works have been accumulating, during the past three centuries, in which the Catholic Church is completely vindicated from the calumnies of her enemies. The work has not, therefore, to be begun but only to be continued, and the contents of the learned and able works which we possess to be diffused in a popular form. It is easy to show what are the real and genuine doctrines and practical principles of the Catholic religion. It is easy to make known the long, unbroken line of saints who, in all ages, have glorified our annals. Easy to show what a multitude of devout and virtuous bishops,

priests, religious and laity, in all ages, have exemplified and honored their religion in their lives. Easy to show that the Catholic Church has been the one great religious, moral and civilizing power in the world since the apostles first went forth to preach. And, of course, the means of diffusing this knowledge must be diligently used by sermons, lectures, books, tracts and periodicals. The practical difficulty is to get what is written to be read and to get an audience to hear sermons when preached in the ordinary course in churches. Those who can be reached in this way are comparatively the smaller number and of the more educated class. The majority can be reached only by popular lectures in places of assembling which are not devoted to worship and, so far as reading matter is concerned, by publications in brief and simple form. It is more by an indirect action on this class of the people through the medium of the more enlightened and educated that we can expect to dissipate their prejudices. A liberal public opinion, percolating through the lower from the higher strata of society and finding expression in the newspapers, is a more universal and powerful agent in affecting this change than any direct appeals from Catholic discourses and writings, and prepares the way for them.

We return, now, to what we have said above, that the most practical and efficacious means of refuting the absurd and atrocious calumnies of fanatics against the Catholic Church, her clergy, and religious orders, is the exhibition of that virtue and sanctity which she requires or counsels, in the lives of her members, especially of ecclesiastics. We must not pass by the orders of religious women, the most devoted and the most holy portion of the flock of Christ, furnishing the most brilliant evidence of the sanctity of the Church, their Mother. But the course of our argument requires that we should confine our remarks mostly to the clergy, who must always stand foremost as the representatives of the Catholic religion, the laity, whether religious or secular, being a reflection of their teaching and example. They are the light of the world and the salt of the earth. If they suffer eclipse or lose their savor, nothing can supply their place. The history of remote countries and times makes but a faint impression on the minds of the majority of people. It is what is present, and before their eyes which affects them. Where the Catholic Church exists, in a sound and flourishing condition, and her note of sanctity is visible in the lives of the clergy, religious, and the devout laity, the old prejudices must disappear, and the calumnies of her enemies cannot be believed. The religion is estimated from the examples of it which are under observation. This is not indeed a positive movement toward belief in the divine authority of the Catholic Church, but only the re-

moval of the principal impediment, a preparation for listening to the preaching of the Catholic Faith. The Catholic Church is included in that wide and liberal estimate of all the organized forms of Christianity, which is now so common, and which regards them as all agreeing in the essentials and differing only in the accidentals. The Chicago Congress of Religions gave the most striking exhibition of the great change which has taken place in the sentiments of a very large portion of the most intelligent, educated and candid American Protestants. But there are many other evidences of the same, in all parts of the country, not the least important being the general tone of the most influential secular newspapers.

This is very far from being an indication of a general movement of return to the Catholic Church. The conversion of America is assuredly a colossal enterprise, and it must seem to most persons one which is presumptuous and impracticable. That its success is certain, it would be rash to affirm. We will not venture to assert that it is even probable. It is certainly possible, though only by an extraordinary intervention of Divine Providence, and an outpouring of grace like that which effected the conversion of the Roman Empire. The conversion of a great multitude is however, morally certain, if due efforts are made for that end. There are already many thousands of converts, and they are found among all ranks of society and all professions, and from many sects, even Unitarians and Jews, as well as from that great body which may be called non-sectarian. The fruit of one week's mission to Protestants in St. Paul's Church, New York, was a hundred converts. It is retorted by some Anti-Catholic writer, that many Catholics fall off from the Church, and that Protestant sects make proselytes some of whom are priests. But there is no parallelism in the case. No Protestant sect can show a list of proselytes comparable to the catalogue of Catholic converts. Apostate priests are generally men who are no loss to the Church, and no gain to any sect, if they join one, which they generally do not, but go into a secular calling without professing any religion, and if they sometimes preserve a worldly respectability, they are exceptions, and the greater number become disreputable characters, who sometimes try to repent at the end of their lives. The most distinguished among these exceptional characters in recent times, is William Gifford Palgrave, second son of the well-known Sir Francis Palgrave, an Oxford graduate, a convert, a zealous Jesuit missionary for fifteen years, a great scholar and traveller, finally British minister at Uruguay. He abandoned his Order, the Church, and Christianity, was near embracing Shintoism, married, and at last, two or three years before his death, which occurred in 1891, he was reconciled to the Church. The value of his testimony to the power of the Catholic

religion over the reason and conscience is even enhanced by his long estrangement. De Lammenais, Loyson, Döllinger, and the few other men of mark who have abandoned the Church within the last half century have not furnished any occasion of congratulation to Protestants. Since the defection of the sixteenth century, there has been no intellectual or moral current carrying away Catholics from motives of conviction or religious devotion into Protestantism. On the contrary, from the sixteenth century to the present time, there has been a stream, sometimes larger, sometimes smaller, in Germany and in England, bringing back from rational and religious motives, as the result of study and thought, and for the sake of making the conscience secure, a large number of the most sincere and earnest members and ministers of the Protestant churches, to the bosom of the Catholic Church. Persons in all walks of life, of all sorts of early breeding, of very various mental and moral temperament and habits, and by many separate paths, have come back to the ancient religion of their fathers. These specimens suggest the thought, that there is no sufficient reason why for each one, there might not be a hundred or a thousand similar examples. How many there have been who have not had the courage of their convictions, we cannot know, but every one who has had experience in this line knows that they are not few. Besides those who have stifled their convictions, there are many others who have begun, and perhaps proceeded far on the way toward a formed conviction of the truth of Catholicism, but have stopped short, and have either rested in some semi-catholic theory, as did Dr. Pusey and Canon Liddon, or have retrograded into rationalism.

Here we find ourselves dealing with phenomena which elude analysis and explanation, and do not afford any sure anticipations of the future. There are mysteries in the operations of divine grace, and the workings of the human mind and conscience, which are inscrutable.

We have seen that the great obstacle to the return of the estranged children of the Church to her bosom is a false view of what the Catholic doctrine and religion really are. When this impediment is removed, and Catholicism is revealed as it really and truly is, there are other obstacles hindering its acceptance, thus far, by the majority. When the Catholic Church is beheld as it really is, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, it is its own witness, and proves itself. It is like the Capitol at Washington, like St. Peter's Church at Rome, like a great battleship flying its national standard. It shows itself to the beholder, on a first view, for what it really is. The note of sanctity is obscured by the calumnies which have created prejudice and by the actual

scandals which have existed, defacing the pages of ecclesiastical history. When this obscurity is removed, and the note of sanctity is made to shine out in all its lustre, the other notes are so obvious that it becomes self-evident that either the one Church, which alone claims the exclusive possession of these prerogatives, is the true Church of Christ, or that there is no organized society existing which has a right to this name. None of the self-styled churches pretend to be the one Church, to the exclusion of all others, but only to be parts of a more universal society. None of them claim to possess, exclusively, the note of sanctity. There is no appearance or claim of Catholicity in any one of them. They claim that they are apostolic in a certain sense, that is, conformed to the apostolic model, and some of them profess to have an apostolic succession in their bishops. But no one of them pretends to have an organized episcopal college possessing, exclusively and completely, the teaching, law-giving, and governing authority and power of the apostolic college. Either there is no organized, undivided body, which is the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, and there are, at most, only separated parts of the formerly united whole, or this church is the Catholic Church, which is concentrated in the Supreme See of Rome and governed by the successor of St. Peter.

This is the universal judgment of all men who are intelligent enough to form any opinion on the subject, whether they call themselves Christians or not. Atheists will admit that if there is a God, the only form of religion worthy of him is Catholicism. Rationalists and Jews will admit that if Jesus Christ is God, the only consistent form of Christianity is Catholicism. All kinds of Protestants will admit that if St. Peter was made the Vicar of Christ, with a perpetual line of successors, the Pope is the successor of St. Peter.

But all those who are alien to the Catholic communion take the negative side of the alternative as it presents itself to their view. Many deny the existence of God and of any religion; others deny that there is any supernatural and revealed religion; others, still, deny that the revelation of truth and law has been committed to a visible church; and others, that this church is essentially constituted in an organic, indivisible unity.

Those who disbelieve in all religion, or in that Christianity which is based on the divinity of Christ, have first to be convinced of the primary articles of the Christian creed before they can listen to any argument for the Catholic Church. The great multitude who are practically infidels, without thought or care for their souls and the future life, and therefore living to a greater or lesser degree in habitual sin, have to be awakened from their fatal

slumber to repentance, and the desire to find the way of pardon and salvation. Such as these, if their consciences are awakened by the preaching of apostolic missionaries, will be easily brought to submit themselves entirely to their direction, being free from the bias of any different religious doctrine.

Those who have a firm and practical belief in the primary articles of the Christian creed, must be convinced and persuaded by means of the positive principles and doctrines which they actually hold, that they are intellectually and morally bound to follow them out to their legitimate conclusions, and to complete the sphere of which they possess a half or three quarters.

For some the process is short and easy when the Catholic Church is once presented to them as it really is. But for others the process is longer, sometimes very long and slow, as in the case of Mary Howitt, in whom it was completed only after her eightieth year.

With the majority of those who have freed themselves from the fetters of anti-Catholic prejudice, and who have no hostile aversion from Catholicism, their progress is arrested by some hindrance, and it becomes an anxious inquiry what is the hindrance which is the most common and the most serious. Of course there are those who are tenaciously attached to the doctrines and practices of some sect with which they are satisfied, and who do not look beyond their own narrow environment. But those who have more enlarged views and sympathies cannot think that the present state of division and even conflict among Christians is normal and must be perpetual, and they must look forward to some change, especially if they anticipate the progress and wide extension of Christianity as the world-religion. There is a dawning light everywhere of the Catholic idea, an aspiration for universal brotherhood and co-operation among all who call themselves disciples of Christ. It seems almost impossible that any intelligent person can believe that the American people and those of Europe can ever become generally Presbyterians, Baptists, or Methodists, or even Protestant Episcopalians, and after that the conversion of the heathen be accomplished.

The fanatical Scotch Covenanters, and the wild Fifth Monarchy men of Cromwell's time, who never reasoned, could believe anything. The Puritans really hoped that they were founding in New England a kingdom of God which would extend its sway over the whole world. But such illusions cannot now pass current. The handful of enthusiasts who call themselves the Catholic Apostolic Church, look for the personal coming of Christ to establish his kingdom on the earth. But sober, sensible men look rather to a reunion of Christians to be brought about by a normal development

of religion from universal principles recognized as a common possession, and attracting the separated elements into the cohesion of unity.

They have an idea of a Catholic Christianity which shall supersede the particularism of divided sects.

And yet this is precisely what keeps a large number who have the most respectful and amicable sentiments toward the Catholic Church stationary where they are, or at least retards their motion. Instead of the genuine Catholicism, there looms up before their imagination the vision of a transformed Catholicism, such as that which Lord Halifax and other High-Churchmen construct by an amalgamation of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches, or Dr. Schaff, as may be seen in his paper read before the Congress of Religions, of these, together with all the self-styled Evangelical Churches. So, the Anglican consoles himself with the thought that he is already a Catholic, awaiting corporate reunion, to be effected by the several hierarchies meeting in a general council. Others come to the same practical conclusion, that they possess already all the essentials, and can abide with a safe conscience where they are, and hoping for the coming era, when all Christians will be brought into fraternal union and harmony.

In all these theoretical and imaginary speculations there is wanting the true conception of the Unity of the Church, and of a dogmatic teaching of the entire system of Christian doctrine, which is infallibly certain, and unchangeable except in the sense of a legitimate development directed by authority. They are, therefore, mere cloud-castles. Such a united Christendom as these dreamers would fain see constructed, is a chimera. There is a still more extravagant chimera, that which Lessing's poetical imagination has endeavored to reduce to the semblance of a definite form in his poem of "Nathan the Wise," and which is the dream of some visionaries of the present time, a world-religion made out of all the theodicies existing in the world combined together.

The one and only world-religion is Christianity. Christianity is Catholicism. Not a vague, indeterminate, nebulous Catholicism, awaiting its form, but the definite, concrete religion of the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, which was from the beginning, is now, and will continue to the end of the world.

There is no union of all Christians possible except in the communion of this Church. How are those who are without to be brought within this communion? It has already been shown sufficiently that it cannot and will not be effected by any dogmatic concession and compromise. There is but one course open; to present pure, undiluted Catholic doctrine to the world, to be accepted or rejected. But how about the discipline? Does the

existing discipline place any barriers which can be removed by concessions or modifications which ecclesiastical authority has full power to make, and that without prejudice to the well-being of the Church?

There is a part of discipline founded in dogma, and above any human power to change. The Papal and Episcopal constitution, the authority of Ecumenical Councils, all that is essential in the offering of the Sacrifice and the administration of Sacraments, and whatever else is established by Divine law, is unchangeable. All that rests solely on ecclesiastical law is within the scope of the supreme power of the Church. Much of this is so long and so firmly embedded in the structure and order of the Catholic religion that it is practically unchangeable, and cannot be justly or prudently modified. There is also a practical application of the universal principles and laws of discipline in different countries and periods which is variable, and has been continually varied as the occasions have arisen. There is, besides, an environment of local and particular customs which spring up spontaneously, like the undergrowth in a forest. There is always in the popular religion a great deal which is Catholic, in the sense of being consistent with Catholic doctrine and law, but not Catholic in the sense of being obligatory or of universal fitness. There is no reason why one should imitate customs which prevail in any Catholic country from a notion that we thereby make ourselves more Catholic, whereas we are only striving to become French, Spanish, or Italian. Our accidental clothing ought to fit ourselves, and we fit our clothing. There is no sense in imitating French vestments, dressing up sacred images like the Spaniards, fitting up churches without pews as in old times, and some foreign countries, adopting books and practices of devotion suitable for other times and places but not for those with whom we have to deal in our own time and place. The mission exercises of St. Alphonsus were all held in the daytime, for night services in churches in Italy are unknown, and would not be approved if they were attempted. In this country missions would be impossible unless the people were assembled before daylight and after dark. The necessity of the case has brought about not only a diminution of the number of holidays of obligation, but a practical relaxation of the law forbidding servile labor on those which remain, excepting Christmas and New Year's Day, as also the precepts of abstinence and fasting from which large dispensations are given. The congresses in which laymen take a prominent part, other conventions of various kinds, and the summer schools which have begun to be held, are remarkable instances of new measures and methods which have been adopted. The participation of Catholic prelates in the Columbian

Congress of Religions is the most striking of all the innovations on old ways which has occurred. These and many other instances which might be adduced prove that the Church has no ironbound, inflexible policy in the methods and measures by which her discipline is practically applied. It is, therefore, quite proper to examine and consider what methods and measures are the wisest and best adapted to their purpose in laboring for the reconciliation of Protestants to the Catholic Church.

The first and principal work to be done is the removal of impediments, the chief of which we have already shown to be a false idea of what the Church really is. The true way to remove this obstacle is to present the true idea of Catholicism, to exhibit Catholic doctrine in its undiluted purity, without addition or diminution: and Catholic discipline, also, in its integrity; the Faith and the Law, the Spirit and the Body of the Catholic religion subsisting in organic unity. This is the reality to be opposed to the chimera of transformed Catholicism, to every form of sectarianism, to rationalism and agnosticism. If its face and figure fail to win the love of any beholders, and their aversion to Catholicism remains as a fixed quantity, it is then an aversion to the true and genuine Catholicism.

It is a great mistake to suppose that any concession in matters which are not pertaining to dogma, or to the strictly essential parts of government, worship and practical order, will avail anything to overcome this aversion. The aversion has the essential for its object. All we have to do is to present the Catholic religion in its true aspect, and as for results, they are beyond our control, so that we have no responsibility.

There are three essential elements which are the constituent principles of the Catholic religion: Dogma, Authority, Worship, including the Sacraments which cluster around the great central Act of Worship, branching out and blooming into ritual and all the rich and variegated flowers of architecture, sculpture, painting and music. These are what have attracted the intelligent and educated converts, who have tried the Lutheran and Anglican forms of Protestantism, one or both, and finding the Mene-Tekel written on their walls, have sought for certainty and completeness of faith, for divine authority in lawgiving and government, for a worship worthy of God and a pure fountain of grace in the Catholic Church.

The only way to attract the multitude who are without to follow their example is to preach, to live, to build up and embody this pure and genuine Catholicism. It is useless to contrive some way of bringing it down to their level, to invent a policy or system conformed to their particular traditions and customs, by tampering

with hierarchical and liturgical forms and order. Those who have not been practically familiar with Protestantism by their experience as members or ministers within some one of its sects, may make mistakes as to the obstacles which impede conversion and the way to remove them. It is not strict ecclesiastical discipline or the outward vesture with which the Church clothes herself which are repulsive. The clergy will not win respect and friendship by adopting secular costume and sinking the priest in the man of the world and society. The government of the Church will not win more approbation by being made less hierarchical and more popular. The public services of the Church will not be made more attractive by a puritan reformation. What scandalizes right-thinking and right-feeling people is insubordination and disrespect toward bishops, divisions and disputes of the clergy, resort to the newspaper methods of partisan warfare, slovenliness about churches and their precincts, a negligent manner of performing sacerdotal functions, and everything else which shows a disregard of ecclesiastical discipline. These are what bring discredit on the Catholic religion. Of course, serious moral delinquency of ecclesiastics, and the scandals of the hangers-on and camp-followers of the Catholic community, the saloon-keepers and saloon-frequenter and such like, are still worse. In short, just so far as the Catholic ideal is carried out in practice, the religion is honored and respected in the world, and all deviations from it have the contrary effect.

The mission of the clergy is, first of all, to cultivate Christian piety and virtue among their people, to co-operate in all wise measures for reforming political and social vices, to work for the amelioration of the condition of workingmen and the poor, to encourage every effort to make good citizens, to teach lessons of patriotism, and in all ways to be the apostles of practical Christianity. And after this, to do all that is possible to invest the Catholic religion with the outward garment of the beauty of holiness, and make the body, by its adornment, show forth the celestial qualities of the spirit which animates it. Then, finally, to preach and exhibit this holy religion to the world without, and only on these conditions can this be done successfully.

A. F. HEWIT, C. S. P.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

ABOUT THE UTAH SAINTS.

THE Mormons have always regarded the island of Great Britain as their best recruiting-ground. On Christmas Day, 1837, their leaders held a conference at Preston, at which they announced that their disciples in England alone numbered a thousand. Forty-one left England for Utah June 6, 1840, being "the first saints that gathered from a foreign land." From those early times to the present Mormonism has been gaining a steadily increasing number of its adherents in Great Britain. Every State in the Union is also represented among them. And it is somewhat singular that little has been done to place before the English-speaking world the real nature of a sect which has attracted so many of the just and the unjust, despite its awful fanaticism. To develop the tenets and policy of the Latter Day Saints in a single article would not be possible. But, without describing their baptism for the dead, their celestial marriage (a euphemism for polygamy), polytheism, the deification of Adam, whom Brigham Young blasphemously styled "the god of the universe," we will give some information, gathered on the spot, of the workings of this peculiar offshoot of Protestantism, merely premising that its distinctive features were polygamy, *plus* politics, farming and commerce. To build up the kingdom, to possess the earth and the fulness thereof, to gratify passion, to make money—behold the ends which were held to justify the most atrocious ways and means since Joseph Smith "made a gathering of the saints" in Ohio and promulgated the "Book of Mormon" early in the thirties.

Away among the western mountains of North America, in a picturesque valley, whose inhabitants of a generation or two ago were wont to describe themselves as living "a thousand miles from everywhere," on the southern slope of a spur of the Wasatch range is the capital of Mormondom, called from the dead sea towards which it looks, Salt Lake City. By the "saints," indeed, it is styled Zion, or the New Jerusalem. And the sluggish stream that laves its banks is euphoniously called the "Jordan River." But to the Gentile world Zion is known by its more commonplace name. In early days it was described to outer barbarians as *Great Salt Lake City*. To the name of every new place in the west it is customary to add, with reference to the future rather than the present, the imposing word *City*. But in visiting such places one need not strain the eyes looking for the spires and domes of a vast metropolis. Cities could not always show one

decent house or twenty log cabins. To reach the *terminus* of a street in a "city" we have had to pass in review the drapery of the population hung out of windows or on clothes-lines zig-zag on the street. But similar drapery may be seen about the palaces of Genova la Superba. When these humble hamlets do really become cities they usually drop the appellation. Denver, when merging from a mining camp into a town, was Denver City. Now that it has become a great railroad centre, with a population of nearly a quarter of a million, the prophetic term has been dropped, and it is simply Denver. Who now speaks of Omaha City or Sacramento City? But we have still Salt Lake City and, for an obvious reason, Kansas City. And under due aspect few places have more right to the title than the Mormon capital. From the first, Zion has had bishops enough, such as they were, to equip half the great cities of Christendom. They were more numerous than any other officials of church or state. And a city, according to an European usage not introduced into the United States, was held to be the seat of a bishop.

In their Scriptural style the early Mormons used to describe their piebald villages as dowered with the beauty of Carmel and the glory of Libanus. Here dwelt Brigham Young, the prophet of the Most High, and hither came multitudes from the ends of the earth "to worship in the place where his feet had trod." Here the glory of the Lord had descended on His chosen one, and the saints exclaimed with enthusiasm: "Our feet have stood in thy courts, O Jerusalem!" Even the physical beauty of the shabby little town was extolled, and, in the glory of her vineyards and cornfields, she was likened to "a bride going forth to meet her beloved." Much of the beauty and freshness ascribed to Zion and its environs was doubtless due to the contrast with the territory through which they were reached. Pleasant was the refreshing greenery of the holy city to the wayfarer who had just passed through prairies interminable, where the sun goes down, as he sinks at sea—a dreary, treeless, rainless expanse, where every species of growth is spinous, a desolate alkali desert, a blighted arid land, on which one might fancy "the Lord had rained fire and brimstone out of heaven." Even the spray of the unpoetic garden-hose, which one sees everywhere in Salt Lake City, is grateful after the white dust of the wilderness, which irritates the eyes, throat and nostrils. And the patches of alfalfa, so common throughout Zion, are as squares of earth jeweled with emeralds, after the blinding glare of the white sun on the white ground, or the white moon on the saline plain, where the effervescence of salt resembles frozen sand. Lovely is the pink-limbed peach-tree after the dusty sage-brush which assumes the neutral tint of

the wilderness, where there is no color save in the sky. And cheering are the broad, dusty streets of Zion to pilgrims who have traversed the ocean-like steppes, *Llano Estacado*, where the Indian sets up stakes in the drifting sand to guide him aright through this deserted bed of some prehistoric sea.

It was homelike, too, to see the crowds pouring out of the tabernacle in thousands of a Sunday evening when one had been familiar with the Indians draped in bright-colored blankets. These they wear as gracefully as a Roman might wear his toga. But their matted hair and greasy faces are rather repulsive to the dainty Caucasian. The sleek, fat cows behind Brother Brigham's corrals were a pleasanter, if less romantic, sight than the fleet antelope skipping over the gray savannahs. Even the low, squat houses of pre-Gentile days, every chimney of which represented a separate family, looked fair and cosy after the white tents and camp-fires of the wilderness. And how restful to the eye were the green grass and the golden corn when one had come through bald, bare cañons or over the Rockies, so desolate in their grandeur—some hoary, weird, grotesque, framing their great heads in the sky; others covered with aspen, beech and pine; their tints contrasting with the brown and gray of the heavy granite boulder and the pale brightness of the milky quartz!

When Brigham led his followers into the Happy Valley, they were, indeed, separated from the whole world, and completely at the mercy of this despot. Gigantic peaks stood as sentinels over the sacred city. Tremendous as were the difficulties of getting out, they were purposely exaggerated. The knowledge that every avenue of escape was closed exerted a powerful influence in forcing them to abide by their fate. By law or otherwise, there was, practically, no redress: "Who entered here left hope behind." Surrounded by barriers almost impassable, of desert and mountain, Utah, and especially the holy city, formed the last and securest stronghold of the Mormon exodus. *L'Etat c'est moi!* The temporal governor and spiritual ruler, Young, an irresponsible despot, was prophet, high priest, and anointed king, whose counsellors might advise, but must not presume to direct him. To strengthen the hands of the Church—*i.e.*, himself—missionaries who would compass sea and land for a proselyte, were sent to the heathen—*i.e.*, every one not a "Saint." Mormon membership is recruited from all religions save the Catholic. Rank and file, who worked under the *ægis* of the Beehive, the Mormon escutcheon, emblem of the industry Young pretended to deify, were mostly ignorant dupes. The best thing this "Prophet, Seer, and Revelator" did was to preach the gospel of work. So far as he could achieve it, the men and women of the Beehive earned their bread in the sweat

of their brow. "No drones in this hive," was his text for many a discourse. "It is a fixed law," said he, "that every man, with few exceptions, is intended to live on his own earnings. No man has a right to eat his daily bread without producing as much in the scale of life as he consumes, and that, too, by some kind of honest physical labor." His disciples mostly became farmers, or laborers, or wrought at mechanical trades, or entered into mercantile business. The richer they became, the more they enriched him. When he purchased property, he graciously allowed them to pay for it, but held it in his own name. As trustee-in-trust, all moneys of the Church passed through his hands. He continued to add house to house, field to field, mine to mine, and to increase his investments and bank deposits till he became a millionaire many times over, as well as absolutism personified.

From the first, the Latter-day Saints, whether east of the Missouri or in the "Valley of Ephraim," were antagonistic to every form of government save their own miserable caricature of a theocracy. The credulous Mormon was taught that his church would overthrow the government at Washington, assume control of the Republic, and finally possess the earth. This monstrous ambition created a civil war in Missouri, and excited the people of Illinois to drive the Saints by force of arms from their borders. Hence, the retreat to Utah, "a thousand miles from everywhere." Here, secure from all interference from the outside world, the arch-Mormon gathered in disciples who brought him the mammon of iniquity, and, in still larger numbers, those who carried neither purse nor scrip. The chiefs, who were a law unto themselves, "counselled"—a "counsel" being the strongest kind of command—"the Saints" to be ready to carry fire and sword to the very gates of the capital. However wild in theory and impossible in practice their designs were, the leaders were ready to sacrifice the rabble for their achievement. Though mostly Americans by birth, the controlling powers never regarded themselves as such, but as citizens of Zion. Full of bombast and hypocrisy, they were chronic rebels to the flag that protected them. When the great Civil War broke out, no Mormon handled a musket on either side. President Young, Czar of all the Mormons, spoke the sentiments of his associates and dupes when he said: "The North prays for the destruction of the South, and the South prays for the destruction of the North, and I say 'Amen' to both prayers."

Often did he point a moral with that Titanic struggle. And not a few of his satellites hoped that the Mormon Church, whose comparative insignificance they knew not, would one day march to victory over the mutilated remains of both armies. To be at variance with the government seemed essential to their status as Mormons.

Brigham Young,¹ undoubtedly, possessed many of the qualities of a great ruler. His suave, plausible manners endeared him to the people, who certainly cherished his memory more than that of any other leader. He would walk about among the laborers on the roadside, descend from his carriage to inquire about a sick brother, shake hands affectionately with some small farmer, and effusively, with eyes and hands lifted heavenward, invoke the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob on the admiring bystanders. We have never heard a Mormon speak against Brother Brigham. More than one hapless woman who spoke with loathing of the horrors of polygamy, placed him above the divine law: "He can do what he pleases; whatever he does is right." Others bear the wretchedness of their forlorn lives as the heaven-appointed cross destined to win an eternal crown. Their faith in Mormon fanaticism seems unshaken, and they accept their bitter lot with sad resignation. But since the incoming of the gentiles many shake off the degrading yoke.

From the first, polygamy, though indignantly repudiated by the leaders, was a characteristic of this latest phase of Protestantism. The founders and higher officials—Smith, Young, Kimble, Grant, Taylor, Wells, all Americans of English lineage—were, without exception, polygamists. In early days this was carefully concealed from the outer world; later, it became their boast. All were consummate hypocrites, ready, when the so-called good of the church required, to assert unblushingly what they knew to be false. Truth, honor, honesty, were unknown qualities among them.

The polygamous feature of this fanaticism attracted much attention from the fact of its bearing so heavily on women. Mormons married two or three sisters at once, and occasionally a mother and her daughter, and even granddaughter. Brigham Young married the sisters Clara and Lucy Decker. His daughters, Fanny and Luna, married George Thatcher; Mary and Caroline, Mark Croxal; Alice and Emily, Hiram Clawson. On these points there was no law save the will of the Prophet. And what God had joined in lawful wedlock—or not joined, as in case of unlawful marriages—he was willing to put asunder for a consideration of ten dollars, the ordinary divorce fee. Money made in this way he declared he gave to his consorts for pin-money, but it was well known that it never got nearer to those poor sultanas than his own pockets.

¹ Brigham Young has been called a psychological freak. His parents were ordinary, his children scarcely average, and not one of his ten brothers or sisters showed any talent whatever. He was a man of splendid appearance; the carriage of his massive head was majestic; he was considerably above middle height, and in his costume wore combinations which would suggest the ridiculous on any one else. But we have never heard of any one daring to laugh at this terrible despot.

He did, however, allow them the windfalls of his blooming orchards, by which they made a pittance in a region remarkable for its fine peaches and apples. Save in the secret archives of the Endowment House, where the occult ordinances of Mormonism took place, no record of marriages was kept. Passing over the "wives" of earlier years, the nineteen women who lived under the roof of the Prophet and ate his bread in the sixties and seventies, derived no social distinction, even in the holy city, from being espoused to the Protestant Sultan. Except the favorite, usually the lady on whom his High Mightiness had bestowed the latest reversion of his hand, all were merely servants without wages—cooks, housemaids, care-takers, laundresses, teachers for the ever-increasing progeny, who did the work and kept everything clean and orderly about the premises. Their wants were frugally supplied; necessities, but no luxuries, were seen in their tidy quarters at the Lion House or the Beehive, which were connected by a row of neat offices. The Beehive is a large white house with a gilded beehive on the top. The portico of the Lion House is decorated with a sculptured lion. The Lion house was his official residence. In the Beehive most of the consorts and their children lived. Seventeen of these degraded women were Americans who were continually boasting of their Anglo-Saxon descent; one was a German, and one an English woman who proposed for the Prophet, offering, like Jacob, conditions reversed, to serve seven years for him. She did work for him for that space, and received the coveted prize. Their son was greatly petted by Brigham, who used to call him: "My English boy." The favorite of the moment ruled the capricious tyrant with a rod of iron. No "plural wife" ever held this precarious post so long as Amelia Folsom, a Massachusetts woman, on whom he bestowed the seventeenth nuptial ring he distributed. Among the sights of Zion, in the midst of a spacious lawn, is the elegant mansion he built her, called the Amelia Palace, in which he died. It perpetuates the memory of their unholy connection in the city that witnessed their sin, but, unhappily, not their repentance.

II.

When we conjure up a vision of Catholic women as we remember them in the long ago—maidens with the innocence of children, matrons with the modesty of maids—we have sometimes wondered if they ever thanked God that they had never seen, nor, indeed, could they imagine, the awful miseries of their sister women in the Mormon valley—*hac lacrymarum valle*—which nature has made so fair. Looking at the hard, disagreeable, ugly faces of the Mormon women who met us at every turn in the City of the Blest, we recalled the sweet, patient, holy countenances grouped about us in

childhood—the matron about whose lineaments lingered the graces of virginity, and the maid through whose bright eyes looked an angelic soul. Whence the difference, yea, the contrast, between woman and woman, maiden and maiden? Ah it is due to faith—virtue. The Catholic belongs to a Church that teaches all holiness. In the Mormon women virtue is in abeyance, if not annihilated; vice in the guise of religion usurps its place, and some of its hideousness shows even in “the human face divine.”

A Catholic friend who has lived many years in Utah writes: “I took the census of 4000 souls, four-fifths of whom were Mormons. I found two married women of English birth whose parents were Catholics. They had left England in early girlhood. Both were illiterate, had received no instruction as Catholics, and were Mormons, not from any belief in the doctrines of Joe Smith or Brigham Young, but on account of the earthly paradise promised them in Zion. Another woman had been baptized a Catholic, she did not know where. I asked if the Mormons were good to her. She said ‘yes.’ I asked in what this goodness consisted, ‘They let me live there,’ she replied, pointing to a mud hovel on the roadside.”

God be praised! Catholic women never accepted the “celestial exaltation” which women are declared to receive by becoming the “plural wives” of Mormon elders. The women of the Beehive are English, Scotch, Welsh, German, Scandinavian, American. The Irish, who may be considered the representative English-speaking Catholics, have been conspicuous only by their absence. Years ago, Henry Ward Beecher, who had little sympathy with the Irish race, and less with the Catholic religion, in lecturing on his “Circuit of the Continent,” gave utterance to the following remarkable words when describing his sojourn in Salt Lake City: “Be it said to the credit of the Irish race, that I have not found a single Irishman or woman in the whole Mormon system. Whether this is due to the teachings of the great Roman religion, or to some inherent virtue in the people, I cannot say, but such is the fact.”

To a considerable extent the Mormon women were “gathered in” from the lower strata of womanhood in non-Catholic countries, and were the offscouring of all. But many women of education (so-called), of wealth and social standing, have been inveigled into this monstrous and pernicious superstition. One of these, who, unasked, gave the writer much information about these peculiar creatures, said: “If it were known that I told you all this, it would get me into great difficulty with our people.” They were captivated by the rude eloquence of bishops, elders, and the “quorum of the seventies,” who preached, in words of striking sound and little meaning, the glory and fulness of the everlasting

gospel, the gifts and graces of the spirit, sedulously concealing the doctrines of polygamy, and blood atonement, and every other repulsive feature of this crude fanaticism.

No wonder that unspeakable wretchedness of body and mind have absorbed from female faces among "the Saints" all beauty and comeliness, and wrought in them the hard look that unsanctified suffering produces. The degraded creatures from whom womanly dignity, sweet refinement, and sustaining self-respect had vanished, and in whose souls the discordant elements of malice, hatred and strife had made their abode, were the slaves, rather than the toys, of capricious tyrants whose boorishness was the least of their foibles.

In Salt Lake City and throughout Utah, the writer was struck with the preternatural ugliness of the women. Issuing from the Tabernacle, squatting on their doorsteps, or lounging about the gates of their dwellings, one could note the hard, wizened features, the defiant, repulsive expression. Having mentioned this all-pervading absence of personal comeliness to friends who rather doubted that it existed to such a remarkable extent, and remembering that tastes differ, we sought other evidence as to the personal appearance of these people. To the query: "How do you find Mormon women as to looks?" an Irish gentleman who has lived many years in Utah, replied: "Decidedly ugly, and this ugliness is more marked throughout the Territory than in the capital. The cast of features is more than plain." Domestic unhappiness and social degradation have furrowed the features and drawn hard lines about the eyes and mouth, making the faces grim and repulsive. We inquired of Gentile visitors, and found that they were impressed as we were. Justin McCarthy speaks of the faces of Mormon women as "dispirited, depressed, shapeless, hopeless, soulless." Indeed, visitors to the Valley of the Saints have been all but unanimous on this subject. Ann Eliza Webb, a Mormon from her birth, and a so-called wife of Brigham, admits the ugliness of the women, but says: "They are pretty enough as children. When the curse of polygamy is forced upon them, they grow hard, or die in their struggles to become inured to this unnatural life."

The Mormons have attracted attention and created excitement out of all proportion to their numerical insignificance. In Utah they are far below 200,000. Many apostatize, but their places are filled by disciples allured by Mormon propagandists in all parts of the globe. The fanatical energy of the governing elders has not slackened. They have publicly renounced polygamy, but "plural wives" now appear as nurses or servants, and the law reaches but few of the wily transgressors.

In 1850 President Filmore appointed Brigham Young governor ; in 1854 another governor was sent out, but Brigham would not be replaced. "I am, and shall be, Governor of Utah," said he, "and no power shall remove me till the Almighty says, 'Brigham, I don't want you in this post any longer.'" He kept his word. To the time of his death, 1877, he broke every power sent to break him, and was, *de facto*, supreme ruler to the last. For thirty-three years this Mokanna may be said to have nominated every officer in Utah. He was president of the "Saints," and all legislative, executive and judicial offices were in his gift. In no instance did the people vote, save as "counselled." Many acts of the legislature were passed simply to convey valuable property to Young, at once the grantee and the governor, whose approval was necessary to the validity of the grant. Nor did this state of things die with the terrible high priest. As late as 1882 the Legislative Assembly consisted of thirty-six members, all Mormons. They met to do the bidding of their chiefs, the United States paying their mileage and *per diem* salaries. It was the aim of the leaders to form a separate independent State, an empire within an empire, destined to crush all other governments and to inherit the earth. They ruled Utah, held the balance of power in Idaho, and wielded a potent influence in Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nevada. They declared themselves, like the Israelites in Egypt, aliens in the land that bore them. The alienism that began with Joe Smith over sixty years ago, has descended from sire to son into this last decade of the nineteenth century. Hence, Gentiles have contended that Mormons should be denied the privilege of voting so long as their fealty is not given to the Washington government, that "the political fangs of Mormonism should be extracted" by the withdrawal of franchise. In public the "Saints" affect the deepest reverence for the laws. But their works agree not with their words. Instead of bringing offenders to justice, they screen them from the officers of the law, and when refractory citizens are tried and punished, they pose as martyrs rather than transgressors.

Federal officers who entered the territory when Brigham Young was king, were traduced and persecuted unless they were as wax in his hands. When, in 1870, he conferred the franchise on women, he was hailed by advanced female suffragists as a liberal, high-minded ruler. But this made elections a greater farce than ever. Every woman voted as her husband dictated, and no man voted except as "counselled." To increase the voters so as to entitle Utah to be admitted into the Union as a State, Mormon leaders resorted to the most unscrupulous measures. It was judicious to provide against a contingency that might arise should Mormon and Gentile votes result in a tie, were men the only

voters. Such a calamity could now be easily averted. The poor Gentile went to the polls with one, or at most, two votes. The Mormon drove up triumphantly with wagons full of wives and children, every one, even the babe in arms, having a vote to deposit. Suffrage became the veriest sham. One of Brigham's consorts says that when ordered to vote she begged to be excused, as she knew nothing of the candidates; but her lord sternly bade her go to the polls, naming his coachman as her political instructor. She never learned the name of the person for whom she voted, but suspected it was for that "calamity of his time," George Q. Cannon, an Englishman, high in office, who more than once had been a convicted criminal. Swedes and Norwegians who could not speak a word of English voted according to the "counsel" of the elders, without the formality of naturalization. Dead "Saints" voted by the proxy of the living. More than we commonly understand by "the quick and the dead" were represented on petitions sent to Congress. Men were known to "christen" their beasts of burden, give them names and surnames, and make them sign or vote—by proxy.

The Prophet was a declared enemy to education, but when the establishment of schools became compulsory, he was equal to the occasion. The school system became, practically, a scheme to erect Mormon meeting-houses at public expense. In these were taught all the abominations of the sect. And as Catholics are often taxed for schools they cannot conscientiously use, so the Gentiles in Utah were forced to support the Mormon system, while maintaining separate schools for their own children. Our modern Mahomet often declared that he would never give a dollar to educate another man's child, that education is a foe to labor, and puts children in danger of becoming "loafers and horse-thieves"; perils to which he exposed his own progeny, some of which he sent to Gentile colleges. But, he was a law unto himself, or above all law. His descendants used to boast of their royal lineage, and take liberties on account of it. There was an absurd story, devoutly believed in the New Jerusalem, of a travelling scion of the House of Young, who refused to give the *pas*, in Hyde Park, to a son of Queen Victoria; and the genuine princes who visited Utah were regarded as offshoots of the effete royalties of Europe, and infinitely inferior to the vigorous sons of Brigham, which, from a physical standpoint, they probably were and are.

As will be readily conjectured, nothing was done to keep the children of the Rocky Mountain "Saints" clean of heart. How could purity be thought of amid such base environments? But to attach them to the Mormon Church and polity, every effort was used, and in the most effective manner. Many immeasurably higher in the scale of morality might take lessons from the value

"The Saints" set on early impressions and associations. It was well said: "Give me the child for the first seven years and do as you will with him afterwards." The future of Mormon children is overshadowed by early associations to a greater extent than any one unacquainted with their peculiar ways could imagine. They are indoctrinated with Mormon tenets, taught to exalt their own and despise every other "persuasion." Intercourse with Gentiles was forbidden as contamination.

Some one said that if a man were permitted to make the ballads of a nation, he need not care who made its laws. The ballads of Utah engraved in the tender hearts of children the pernicious principles of a disgraceful sect. Doggerel, dignified by the name of poetry, striking couplets, sharp epigrams, were committed to memory, or sung from the church hymn books, by the camp-fires, on plains g'ittering with salt crystals, within the bare walls of the huge, ugly tabernacle, on the school-bench by day, and under the roof-tree at night. The Deity was thanked for having mercifully brought the choristers into the bosom of the Church of the Latter Day Saints, and taught them a faith, whereby they were to be savingly converted. Some were sung to bold defiant airs, with staccato movement; some to music appealing and sonorous; some to easy negro melodies. Brigham's favorite air was "Gentle Annie." The singers were "the chosen few," whose mission was to build up the waste places of Zion, and make the desert blossom like the rose. They sang the glories of the promised land, the city of refuge, where "the Saints" were beyond the reach of their enemies, with none to molest them.

Catholics who were formerly Mormons, have often expatiated on the extreme difficulty of shaking off their early impressions. Nor could they readily forget the coarse rhymes in which their earlier creed was enshrined. Snatches of these were often unconsciously warbled, even by some who had learned the glorious "*Porta manes et stella maris*" of the Universal Church.

Some effusions sung in the tabernacle could not be quoted here. Absurd, utterly worthless, beneath criticism, as most of them are, they always crystallize Mormon tenets. If the more intelligent Mormon could despise the angry denunciations of cunning elders, and rid himself of early associations, the greatest obstacles to his conversion would be removed. But under a system of utter subjection to a despot, freedom was annihilated. The people, irreverently styled in non Catholic phraseology "the masses," were as "dumb, driven cattle," and rarely had any one the spirit to "be a hero in the strife." "To resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly." A recalcitrant member who after the first or second admonition refused to submit to the great Moslem, soon "disappeared," and his place knew him no more.

III.

In August, 1866, Father Kelly, of Grass Valley, was made pastor of Salt Lake City by Right Rev. Eugene O'Connell, to whom the Holy See confided Utah Territory in 1865. Father Kelly bought the ground on which the little cathedral now stands. In 1868 a Catholic bishop visited Zion for the first time, and said mass at the residence of Judge Marshall, whose guest he remained for a fortnight. Among the names of the first Catholics are O'Reilly, Barron, Byrne, Kennelly, Vaughan, Dahler and Simpkins.

Father Foley succeeded Father Kelly, and early in 1871 opened a subscription list for the erection of a church. Though few, and mostly poor, Catholics were so generous that the church was finished in a few months and dedicated to St. Mary Magdalen, November 26, 1871. In 1873 Rev. Lawrence Scanlon devoted his energies to the spread of the true faith in Salt Lake Valley; in 1887 he became Vicar Apostolic, and later bishop of the holy city. Under the able administration of this zealous prelate religion has made rapid strides. The church in which the sacred mysteries have been celebrated for a score of years is now too small for the constantly-increasing congregation, and zealous Catholics hope that the spires of a splendid cathedral will soon overlook this New Jerusalem.

More quickly than any other means would the spread of Catholic doctrine destroy this new Islamism, and hence Young would never have allowed the Church to gain a foothold had he been able to keep it out. The establishing of soldiers, many of whom were Irish Catholics, at Fort Douglas, on a plateau above the city, and the immense number of miners, smelters, stokers of the same religion and nationality that flocked to Zion after the opening of the railroads, in 1869, made it impossible for him to keep it out. The first priests were persecuted at his instigation. A coffin was sent to Father Kelly, with an intimation that he would soon be put in a state to occupy it. He boldly complained to the Prophet, who denied all knowledge of an outrage perpetrated by his orders, and declared himself the protector of Catholics. This adaptable ruler ever after professed strong friendship for the priest, and often said: "If Father Kelly had stayed long enough and tried hard enough he might have made a Catholic of me; but I tried my best to make a Mormon of him without a shadow of success." Young and other Mormon lights showed much esteem for Catholics. A high official said to the writer: "We all like the Catholics. They do not annoy or persecute us; they treat us like gentlemen." If Catholics spoke of the peculiar institution, they felt that it is only Catholics who could do so with authority. For they saw

little difference between their own system and the progressive polygamy practiced wherever divorce holds sway. Some of Young's descendants have renounced polygamy, and a few have become Catholics. A grandson of his was elected city marshal of Zion on the Liberal ticket. During the campaign he spoke of his people as misled and benighted, and never alluded to his royal pedigree. Several intelligent Mormons say that it is useless to uphold their doctrines against the sea of enlightenment with which emigration is flooding Utah, which has grown quite commonplace, and is no longer the Western Wonderland. Graded streets, castle-like edifices, gas, electric lights and other modern improvements brought in by the Gentiles—who quickly emptied the exchequer, and were even so fashionable as to go in debt—have quite changed the aspect of the rural village, with dusty streets, adobe or frame cottages, embowering shrubbery, and little runnels like those of old Berne,—the holy city of Brigham's day. In a Christian aspect, things are brighter to-day than they have yet been in the stronghold of the "Saints." It has been proclaimed, and in no uncertain tones, that the Mormons must conform to the law or cease to exist as a body. This would, at one fell swoop, destroy the most debasing feature—polygamy. Loyal subjects will not stand on the same plane with fanatics who assume to have a mission to uproot every government. The Royal Brigham made them slaves; the Catholic Church shows them the blessed "freedom wherewith Christ has made us free." The Gentiles now outnumber the Mormons, and recent victories show that Utah is at last a fit abode for the brave and the free. The decision of Judge Anderson, in refusing to admit to citizenship men bound by the horrible oaths of the Endowment House, embodied an impartial epitome of Mormon subterfuge and treachery. But this fanaticism dies hard; it has not only nine, but nine hundred lives.

The incoming of non-Mormons has not done all that optimists expected; nevertheless, its effects are felt. Even fashion has contributed to wound this moral cancer in the breast of the nation. It costs money to dress fashionably, and "plural wives" are not always content to be servants without wages. Even in the Valley of the Blest, women will assert themselves, and "Saints" copy style from their Gentile sisters. The cotton gowns and sun-bonnets of early days, and the hideous "Deseret costume" of linsey and antelope hide, designed by the Prophet for the women of the Beehive, could no more be revived to-day than could the laws and usages of the Saxon Heptarchy.

A great work has been begun in Utah by Catholic agencies. Ecclesiastics, with their helpers, in exemplifying the purity and

sanctity of Catholic teachings, before men steeped in every abomination, have caused many a sinner to say, as did St. Augustine, when he considered the virtues of the genuine Saints: "Cannot I do what these have done?" When Mormons enter the Church, their allegiance is transferred from the Sultan of Zion to the President of the United States, and they cannot be good Catholics without being good citizens.

Suffrage, the acknowledged palladium of the freeman's liberty, is free, and Gentiles have been voted into office in Utah. The law, sustained by a healthy public opinion, is doing away with the more loathsome features of this abhorred system. But among the determining causes which will destroy this moral leprosy, grafted by sensual, avaricious men on a false religion, the most powerful is the spread of Catholic principles. Where woman was most degraded, woman must reign a queen—the Woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and the stars of heaven for her diadem. Mary, the purest of Virgins, will sanctify the fertile vales and blooming gardens of Utah. The great Mother of Mercy will look lovingly on these poor children of fanaticism, and her glance creates purity.

In 1870 Brigham Young invited the Sisters of Mercy to his city, and when these Sisters visited him he showed them every courtesy. He used to say, that he had never met his superior, and there was no one on earth to whom he would raise his hat. He refused this courtesy to royalties visiting his capital. "The master should hang his hat on the peg the Almighty made for it—his head, of course," said Bishop Kimball, one of his sycophantic admirers. But he did doff his hat to the Sisters, gave them, unasked, twenty dollars for their charities, and showed them to their carriage with extreme politeness. He invited other Sisters to come to him whenever they needed spiritual advice and direction! In 1875, when Sisters came to stay, Mormon children went to them in great crowds, but were soon "counselled" to leave, the Mormon oligarchy being convinced that children educated in a convent could never become good Mormons.

Brigham died August 29, 1877, being as old as the century. One of his daughters said, his last words were, "Joseph! Joseph!" His disciples understood that he called on Joe Smith, who had led him into Mormonism, either in reverence or in reproach. Some Catholics, to whom he had shown courtesy, hoped against hope, that he was calling on St. Joseph! A grandson of his declared, that he said, just before he died, "I never had a wife but one, and that was my first."

Like Joe Smith, he was a persistent violator of the ten commandments. If his hand did no murder, murders were done at

his instigation by a secret society sworn to do his will, the Danites, Avenging Angels, or Destroying Angels. A profound hypocrite, an able politician, as leader of the Saints for thirty-three years, he showed much executive ability. Most of his children were girls, and preceded him to the tomb. In early times, he would not allow his disciples medical aid, but undertook to cure the sick by the laying on of hands. When ill himself, however, he always had as many physicians as could be got. He left nineteen widows and about thirty children. His millions were divided among his families. No restitution was made to those whom he had robbed or cheated, and, as far as we could ascertain on the spot, he died as he had lived. His grave, in a large green near his old dwelling, behind the Eagle Gate, is one of the sights of Zion. Several of his consorts are buried beside him, an honor which will be accorded to any among the rest who may die without contracting another marriage.¹

Brigham Young told the Sisters of Mercy who visited the holy city when he was in the zenith of his power and fame, that he had heartily wished and earnestly tried to induce an Irish colony to join the Saints in Utah; and he boasted that whatever he set his heart on he accomplished. An Irish colony came, but not in the guise he had hoped for. The bishop and most of the clergy and religious are of that nationality—the zealous clergy who have erected schools, churches, and hospitals, and the dark-robed daughters of the faith, who gather in the little ones of Christ, are as the lightning-rods of Utah to turn the divine vengeance from her people. These are chief among the causes which will determine the gradual, if not rapid, overthrow of this latest development of the Reformation. Disciples will be attracted to the true faith by seeing in the children of the Church illustrations of the sanctity which Mary fosters in those who love her. God, Himself, by His omnipotent grace, will work, sweetly and peaceably, this “charge of the right hand of the Most High.” The deluded victims of a vicious system will become “the clean of heart,” destined to see God, and pronounced “blessed” by the mouth of the Word Incarnate. “O, how beautiful is the chaste generation in glory; the memory thereof is immortal.”

M. A. C.

¹ Both as a prophet, and as Thaumaturgus, the enterprising Brigham was very unfortunate. But the credulity of the Salt Lakers was inexhaustible. When he said, “Do you believe that I know what is coming? That I can work this miracle?” The answer was an enthusiastic “Yes.” Once, Joe Smith said he would walk dry-shod over a river; but he paused on the brink, and asked his followers, “Do you believe I can do what I say?” They replied in the affirmative. “Well, then,” said he, “that is the same as if I had done it!” an answer which did not shake the implicit faith of the advanced or the neophytes in the founder of Mormonism.

OLD TESTAMENT SUBJECTS IN EARLY CHRISTIAN ART.

EARLY Christian art being essentially symbolical, continued and purified the traditions of ancient art: for Symbolism was the original characteristic of all religious teaching, whether true or false, and, except among the Hebrews, religious teaching was largely conveyed by visible delineations. Clement of Alexandria, in the third century, said in his "Stromata," or Miscellanies, in which he was discussing secret teaching, that "All who have treated of divine matters, both Greeks and Barbarians, have veiled the principles of things, and delivered the Truth enigmatically by signs, symbols, and allegories."¹ The same idea is expressed by the great Origen in his answer to Celsus: "That some truths should be conveyed to the public in a less developed manner, is common to Christian doctrine and to the teachings of (profane) philosophy, in which certain things are exoteric and others esoteric."²

The principal subject of early Christian art was religious truth, and this could not be conveyed through the senses and in a manner accommodated to the illiterate and the ignorant save in a symbolical way. Such a mode of imparting instruction was sanctioned by our Lord and His apostles. "The parables in the Gospel," say Northcote and Brownlow, "are real pictures, and they are symbolical; they suggest and teach religious truths by means of sights and acts of ordinary life, invested with a spiritual meaning."³ Saint Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, and in his first to the Corinthians, must also be cited in testimony of this Scriptural symbolism. Before the end of the second century, the celebrated Melito, bishop of Sardis—one of the Seven Churches of Asia⁴—wrote a very curious book, called by Eusebius "The Key," in which the author unfolds the hidden and mystical sense of words and things in the Bible.⁵

¹ "Omnes ergo, ut semel dicam, qui de rebus divinis tractarunt, tam barbari, quam Graeci, rerum quidem principia occultaverunt; veritatem autem aenigmatibus, signisque ac symbolis, et allegoriis rursus et metaphoris, et quibusdam talibus tropis modisque tradiderunt."—(Stromatum, lib. v., cap. iv., ed Migne.)

² "Caeterum esse quaedam reconditiora nec omnibus relecta id Christianae doctrinae commune est cum philosophia, ubi quaedam exteriora quaedam etiam interiora sunt."—(Lib. i., c. 7.)

³ *Roma Sotterranea*, vol. ii., p. 40.

⁴ Apoc., iii., 1.

⁵ The whole second volume of the *Spicilegium Solesmense* of the late very learned Cardinal Pitra, O.S.B.—whom we count it an honor to have known—is taken up with

In writing of early Christian art we give it the widest range, so as to include paintings, mosaics, sculptures, bas-reliefs, carved ivories, gilded glasses (of which the South Kensington Museum, London, has a rich collection), and bronze and terra-cotta lamps, etc. We present the following as an almost complete cycle of Old Testament subjects, having a fixed traditional form, and constantly repeated, except two or three, which have been found, as yet, but rarely: God, the Father; Adam and Eve; Cain and Abel; Noe; Sacrifice of Isaac; the Patriarch Joseph; Moses; Passage of the Red Sea; Grapes of Nehelescol;¹ Crossing of the River Jordan; David and Goliath; Translation of Elias; Vision of Ezechiel; Daniel in the Lions' Den; Three Children in the Fiery Furnace; Job; Samson; Susanna; Tobias; Jonas. Only some of these will be mentioned by us in any detail. There are many biblical scenes in which an artistic representation, or rather suggestion, of the Eternal Father was required. The pastors of the Church under whose direction the artists carried out their designs, never, during the first four centuries, indicated the power and intervention of God, who is a pure spirit and known only by His works, except by a Hand issuing out of a cloud or projected from above. This symbol is evidently derived from the language of the Psalms, Exodus, and Isaias, where the word signifying a hand is used to indicate the action of the Omnipotent. Thus, Moses receives the Tables of the Law on Mount Sinai; thus, the arm of Abraham is stayed in the imminent sacrifice of Isaac. After the fourth century, when all danger of an anthropomorphic sense was excluded, God is represented seated on a rock, or on a throne, and delivering an armful of grain and a young lamb to Adam and Eve, who stand respectfully before Him. Such a scene describes artistically the doom of our first parents to a life of labor; the man in tilling the soil, the woman in working the fleece. Although this particular occupation is not mentioned in Genesis,² yet the traditions of early Christian art—founded upon still earlier and primeval traditions—lived long after the art itself had passed away, for mediæval allusions to digging the earth and spinning wool, as the occupations of our first parents, are very common, and survive in this old Scotch couplet—suggesting, also, the original equality of all men:

Saint Melito and his works. The Greek original of the *Clavis* is lost, but MSS. are extant of a Latin translation; and an edition of it in this language, founded on no fewer than eight mediæval manuscripts, was published with numerous and valuable notes by the eminent Benedictine. The attack upon it by Rev. George Salmon, in Smith and Wace's *Dict. of Christian Biography*, vol. iii., is not conclusive.

¹ Numbers, xiii., 24-25.

² iii., 16-17.

"When Adam delled and Eve span,
Quhair war a' the Gentles than?"

The fall of our first parents is a frequent subject in early Christian art. It was treated in several scenes, as the Temptation, the Transgression, the Condemnation, the Expulsion. The figure of the first Adam by whom sin and death entered into the world, recalled to the early Christians the second Adam by whom is grace and life; and the idea is clearly indicated in a bronze medallion described by Buonarrotti in which the Good Shepherd carrying the lost sheep on his shoulders is shown in a compartment just above Adam and Eve, who are eating the forbidden fruit. This may also have been an artistic protest against the impious doctrine of Tatian—who fell away from the Church—denying the repentance and salvation of Adam. The fact that by eating "of the tree of knowledge of good and evil,"¹ the eyes of our first parents were opened, and they perceived themselves to be naked, is always denoted in artistic representations of the Fall. They usually stand on either side of the fatal tree, around which the serpent is coiled, and strive to hide their shame, sometimes with their hands alone, sometimes with fig leaves. Our Catholic translators render the *Perizomata* of the Vulgate by "aprons"; and the old English Protestant version made at Geneva in 1557 is commonly called the *Breeches Bible* on account of the ridiculous rendering of Genesis iii., 7. The Expulsion from Eden is represented on a sarcophagus of the Lateran Museum. On a famous old sarcophagus of Milan, described by Allegranza, in the scene of the Expulsion, we see represented a tree for the Paradise from which our parents were expelled, Adam busied in tilling the earth, and Eve *extracting a thorn from her foot*. It is curious to speculate upon what source Saint Bernard derived the idea of connecting Eve with a thorn—was it, perhaps, from the tradition of or from seeing some such specimen of early Christian art? In one of his sermons on the Blessed Virgin Mary he says so emphatically: "Eva spina fuit, Maria rosa exstitit. Eva spina vulnerando, Maria rosa omnium affectus mulcendo. Eva spina infigens omnibus mortem, Maria rosa reddens salutariferam omnibus Sortem."²

¹ Genesis, ii., 17.

² The contrast is striking between the sorrowful but noble lines that close our *Paradise Lost*:

"They, hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow,
Through Eden took their solitary way,"

and the sanguinary ending of the great epic of the Romans—a people, as the apostle wrote "without mercy"—the deliberate killing of a wounded prisoner: *Vitaque cum-gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras*—and Life, with a sigh, fled into the valley of Death. (*Æneid.*, xii., 952.)

Cain and Abel is a subject found oftener on sculptured sarcophagi than on mural decorations. In bas-reliefs the brothers are represented in the act of offering, the one a sheaf of wheat or a cluster of grapes, the other a lamb to a noble looking personage seated on a throne, and resting his feet on a *suppedaneum* or stool—an attribute given in antiquity only to people of quality—who makes with his left hand a gesture of refusing the homage of Cain, and with his right, that of accepting the fealty of Abel. The pious younger brother is the earliest figure of the Redeemer in the Old Testament. A magnificent mosaic in the sanctuary of the Byzantine Church of *San Vitale*, at Ravenna (A.D. 526), represents in one great scene the most illustrious types of the Bloody and Unbloody sacrifice to be met with in the Sacred Scriptures, and brings them advisedly together. Above and in the centre is the Divine hand coming down out of heaven, emblem, as we have said, of the omnipotent God. On one side Abel, clad like an antique shepherd in some animal's skin, with a plaid thrown over his left shoulder, and sandals on his feet, coming out of a hut, beside which grows a tree, offers a lamb with arms uplifted over the altar. On the other side, Melchisedech, clothed in sacerdotal vestments of white and gold, advances from the portals of a palace to the same richly draped altar, on which is a chalice (of the kind called *ansata* because two-handed), between two small loaves of bread. Standing at the altar he raises in his hands a larger loaf towards the mysterious emblem.¹ There can be no doubt as to who these personages are, for the names ABEL, MELCHISEDEC are written over their heads. Melchisedech, as the more perfect figure of Jesus Christ, King and Priest, being "likened to the Son of God,"² is distinguished by having a circular nimbus about his head. Here we have a beautiful and instructive representation in most vivid colors of two types of the same Mystery manifested two thousand years apart, the sacrifice of the lamb by Abel, prefiguring the death on the cross of the true Lamb of God "who taketh away the sin of the world,"³ and the offering by Melchisedech, typefying the "clean oblation"⁴ and Real presence under the form and appearance of bread and wine in the eucharistic Sacrifice of the New Law. The Church has connected the idea and the sense of these types, now realized, in that wonderfully ancient prayer of the Canon of the Mass: "Vouchsafe . . . to accept . . . as Thou wert graciously

¹ May we not suppose that by these loaves of different sizes, the artist meant to suggest the Host for the Mass—as we would now say, and the little Hosts for the communion of the faithful?

² *Hebrews*, vii., 3.

³ *John*, i., 29.

⁴ *Mal.*, i., 11.

pleased to accept the gifts of Thy just servant Abel, . . . and that which Thy high-priest Melchisedech offered to Thee, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate host."¹

Noe in the Ark as a symbol of the Church out of which there is no salvation and Noe as a type of humanity redeemed and admitted to the Church through the waters of Baptism, and the Dove carrying the olive branch of peace, a figure of the Holy Spirit that comforteth, are constantly repeated in early Christian art. It is an image of the Church militant in which man wars against the raging elements of Sin and Hell and escapes the anger of God. On the tombs of the faithful, it signified their death in the communion of the Church and is an equivalent of the *In Pace* of Christian inscriptions. Northcote and Brownlow in treating of the history of Noe in the chapter on Biblical Paintings, remark, "Of what an endless variety of compositions is not this subject capable, and how variously has it not been treated in all the schools of modern art? Yet throughout the whole range of the Roman Catacombs we find but one type of it, and that removed as far as possible from historical truth. Instead of a huge ark riding upon the waves and containing eight persons, together with a vast multitude of living animals, we have a single individual almost filling the small box in which he stands, whilst a dove, bearing an olive branch, flies toward him. The occupant of the ark is often a woman or a child, instead of a man; and in one instance at least, on a sarcophagus in the Lateran Museum, the name JULIANE is added, *i.e.*, the name of the deceased on whose grave it was figured."² We have an early clue to the right interpretation of this subject in Saint Peter's First Epistle,³ and some of the Fathers have drawn out the sense in all its circumstances. Thus Saint Cyprian, Saint Ambrose, Saint Maximus of Turin, and Saint Augustine in his *Epist. contra Donatistas vulgo De unit. Eccl.* cap. v. 9 and *Enarrat. in Psalmos.* ciii. Sermo iii., 2. When therefore, we look on this scene we are certain that it was intended to convey in Christian art the doctrine of remission of sins through Baptism, the gifts of heavenly grace from the Holy Spirit,⁴ and salvation in the mystical ark of the Church which is the barque of Peter.⁵

¹ Benedict XIV., a pope equally pious as learned, answers the query why is Christ here called a Priest according to the order, not of Aaron, but of Melchisedech? in his treatise *De Sacrificio Missæ*, p. 83.

² *Rom. Sott.*, vol. ii., p. 105.

³ iii., 20-21.

⁴ Perhaps with special allusion to the Sacrament of Confirmation which was usually given in the early ages immediately after Baptism.

⁵ The famous coins of Apamea in Phrygia, first described by the celebrated antiquary Eckhel, in the third volume of his stupendous work *Doctrina Nummorum Vete-*

The late Charles Lenormant has summed up the controversy in his essay on Christian Emblems found on some Numismatical remains of the third century: *Des signes de Christianisme qu'on trouve sur quelques monuments numismatiques du troisieme siècle*.¹ Among all the stirring events in the life of the great patriarch Abraham, that one of his faith and his obedience in the sacrifice of his son Isaac, is singled out for constant representation in early Christian art. The typical sense of the offering of Isaac is suggested by Saint Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, xii., 19, and it was always taken as a figure of the sacrifice of the Son of God upon the cross. The much-loved Isaac represented the innocent Saviour as did also (for *Omnis comparatio claudicat*) the substituted "Ram amongst the briars sticking fast by the horns,"² which was sacrificed in place of the boy and which Saint Prosper takes for a particular image of our Lord crowned with thorns in his sacred Passion. This episode so often repeated in the catacombs and ancient places of Christian worship was directed to teach the faithful confidence in God's promises, patience in persecution, constancy in suffering, and, as Love is the end of the Law—incomparable gratitude to Him who died that we might live. It was the most popular of all the Old Testament (as the Good Shepherd was of New Testament) subjects. It is found in painting, sculpture and mosaic, on gilded glass, and engraved on rings and gems and impressed on earthen-ware lamps and utensils. Moses, the Law-giver and Deliverer of the Jews, being so manifest a figure of Christ the Teacher and Redeemer, is frequently reproduced, especially in those scenes and incidents of his career which had a moral and, symbolically, a sacramental character. The first scene represents him putting off his shoes from his feet, at the command of the Voice from the burning bush on Horeb.³ This act was regarded by the Fathers as significant of setting aside all worldly thoughts and cares in approaching the divine Presence, but more especially as typical (say Saints Augustine and Gregory Nazianzen) of the renunciations made in Baptism. When found on Christian tombs it seems to indicate one who died at a mature age and soon after receiving the sacrament of Regeneration. The Passage of the Red Sea was universally accepted as a type of Baptism. Being a subject that requires a larger and longer space to represent it, we more often find it on the front of imposing sarcophagi. Some of the minor details are very touching. Millin (*Midi de la France*)

rum (Vienna, 1792-1798, 8 vols., 4to.), and enlarged upon by Wiseman in his *Lectures on the Connection Between Science and Revealed Religion*, represent the subject of Noe in the Ark, but in a manner different from and posterior to the earliest Christian representations of the same which therefore were *not* copied from pagan originals.

¹ P. 4.

² Gen., xxii., 13.

³ Exod., iii., 5.

gives a striking one found at Arles and now in the municipal museum at Aix, which represents the Exodus out of Egypt and the destruction of Pharaoh and his Host, and recalls to our minds the magnificent mural painting in the Vatican designed by Raphael, executed by Giulio Romano, of the defeat of Maxentius and the Triumph of Constantine, first Christian emperor, for its analogy with the overthrow of the Egyptians and the deliverance of the Chosen People. Moses Striking the Rock merits particular mention, for its great popularity as typifying the waters of Baptism and the abundant supply of spiritual grace and strength flowing from the smitten rock—"and the rock was Christ."¹

In connection with this scene in the life of Moses we often find an extraordinary but not violent or unnatural turn and combination given to it that not only evidences, as a Protestant writer says, "the complete identification of the two revelations in the mind of the early Christians," but confirms artistically, as we insist, the Catholic doctrine of the Primacy, Saint Peter, whom Prudentius calls "the leader of the new Israel," being regarded as the anti-type of Moses. We mean that in some representations there is a marked and evidently an intended resemblance of Moses in the general appearance of his hair and beard and outline of features to the traditional type of the Prince of the Apostles; and in two instances already discovered, the very name *Petrus* is written beside the figure of the Jewish law-giver. A striking confirmation, from an unexpected quarter, of the Moses-Peter type, as already revealed by Roman monuments, was furnished by an ancient and extremely valuable large glass plate found at Podgoritz, in Dalmatia, a few years ago, and now in the private collection of Mr. A. Basilewsky, at Paris. On it are rudely scratched a number of scenes and figures, all from the Old Testament, except one, the raising of Lazarus, and each explained by a few words of unclassical Latin. Among them is—as we would expect in any such cycle—the Striking of the Rock;² but with this remarkable adjunct that the legend in cursive characters beside the man who extends the emblem of power towards the outgushing waters which fall at his feet reads, when cleared of its barbarisms, *Petrus virga percussit, fontes cœperunt currere*—"Peter struck with the Rod, the Streams began to flow."

This *Insigne tazza vitrea figurata*, as De Rossi calls it, was described by the learned archæologist in the *Bullettino* for 1874, p. 153, and again, more fully with an engraving, in that of 1877, p. 77. The taking up of Elias as a type of our Lord's ascension and a figure of the resurrection of the body; also Jonas as a type of

¹ I Cor., x, 4.

² Numbers, xx., 11.

our Lord's rising from the dead on the third day; Job on his dung-hill surpassing all the imagination of philosophers about a just man struggling with adversity, and type of a Holier One than he; Tobias catching the fish whose gall banished the Evil Spirit and healed even temporal infirmity, and regarded by the early Christians as a distinct type of Christ, the true *Ichthys*, which gives us the initials of the Greek words, meaning "Jesus Christ the Son of God our Saviour,"¹ and other Old Testament subjects, must be passed over without further notice in this article. As, however, the touching and instructive story of Susanna is reckoned by Protestants an apocryphal addition to the Book of Daniel, it merits more than a passing mention, since the unvarying tradition of the Apostolic See, which always retained it in the Canon of Scripture, receives so strong a confirmation from early Christian art. This subject is found in painting and in sculpture. Susanna was a figure of the Church, the spotless Bride of Christ, persecuted by Jews and Gentiles, older than she in years and gray in sin.² Perret has published an allegorical painting of this subject discovered in the catacomb of *San Callisto*, at Rome, in 1845. A lamb which has a collar of pearls around the neck,³ and the name *Susanna* written over it, stands in an attitude of mingled fear and resolution between two ferocious-looking beasts, two wolves, or, perhaps, and more probably, a wolf and a leopard, which seem about to seize their prey. Over one of these is written *senioris* (for *seniores*), meaning elders, so that the artist by no means intended a mere representation of any Christian beset by danger and temptations: "Behold I send you as lambs among wolves,"⁴ but some higher and far more general idea.⁵ The story of Susanna was more common on the sarcophagi of Southern Gaul than elsewhere. These bas-reliefs represent the two Elders, trees,⁶ and the chaste Susanna with a veil or covering on her head. An oft-repeated accessory, which Martigny believes to have reference to certain local and insidious attacks on the Church of Gaul in the fourth and fifth cen-

¹ Saint Augustine fully explains this famous acrostic of the Sybilline verses in the *De Civitate Dei*, xvii., 23; Cardinal Wiseman, "Essays," vol. v., in English, and Cardinal Pitra, "Spicilegium Solesmense," vol. i., appendix v., in Latin, have given and commented on the famous *Ichthys* Inscription of Autun, while the latter has also compiled all accessible information from ancient and modern sources about the fish-symbol of the early Christians, in the appendix to the third volume of the "Spic. Solesm.": "*Ichthys, Sive de Piscis Allegorico et Symbolico*," pp. 499-629.

² Saint Hippolytus, A.D. 222-235, *De Susanna*.

³ May we not see here an allusion to Canticle I., 9: "Thy cheeks are beautiful as the turtle dove's; thy neck as jewels"—words addressed by the spouse to his mystical bride, the Church, of which, as we have said, Susanna was a type.

⁴ Luke, x., 3.

⁵ Louis Perret, *Les Catacombes de Rome*, vol. i., pl. 78.

⁶ "Her husband's orchard," Dan. xiii., 7.

turies, is a serpent entwined about a tree and darting towards a nest of doves in its branches.

In concluding this short article it might not be inappropriate to say a word concerning those now rare but once very common religious picture-books of the Middle Ages, called *Biblia Pauperum*, or Bibles of the Poor, and to which the late and much-lamented De Rossi has twice called attention in his celebrated *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*. In 1863, among the very first numbers of this serial (p. 40), he treats of the "*Biblia Pauperum*" on occasion of the recent publication of a copy from a fourteenth century manuscript found in the monastery of Saint Florian, near Vienna, and shows that they are the connecting links in the long chain of Christian Art so abruptly broken at the period of the Renaissance. The pictures of the "*Biblia Pauperum*," which were remotely derived through many secondary but not substantial alterations from the paintings of the catacombs and the sarcophagi of later ages, were copied in sculptures, in wall-paintings, in altar-pieces, and in the exquisite colored windows of mediæval churches. From them we can trace out which of the ancient types of early Christian art were continued, which were modified, and which were finally lost or discarded. In the year 1887 De Rossi returned to the subject in an article on *La Biblia Pauperum e le sue origini antichissime* (p. 56), which ends with a renewed assurance that the remote originals of these curious xylographs are to be found in the frescos of Subterranean Rome and in the marble work of the fourth and fifth centuries; and commenting on the religious and artistic treasures brought away so abundantly to England and other parts of Northern Europe in the seventh century, he connects the *Biblia Pauperum* with the still earlier illuminated manuscripts—*Concordia veteris et novi testamenti*—and these, in their turn, with the remains of primitive Christian Art.

ROBERT SETON.

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS.

HAD the life of Shakespeare been lengthened by a quarter of a century, he would have met many gigantic figures which were worthy of portrayal by his magic pen. The hideously grand period of the Thirty Years' War, that era of crimes which were more horrible than any which had visited earth since the days of pagan antiquity, was prolific of prodigious beings—a kind of moral Centaurs—half brigands and half great men. The heroes of this struggle were portentously original, and some of them, man-eaters and gold-consumers—for instance, Mansfeld, Halbertaedt, and Wallenstein—were sovereignly detestable. Shakespeare would certainly have discerned a fit subject for his pen in Wallenstein; that colossal satrap who would have been more at home in dark and violent Asia than in Europe; that taciturn fighter who was never known to laugh, and whose soldiers declared that he communed with demons; that ostensible Catholic who believed only in judicial astrology, and who was neither Christian nor pagan nor human; that inscrutable sphynx and abyss of ambition, who is still as much of an enigma as he was during his life and in his death. And how well the divine William would have depicted him who was, in all probability, the sole disinterested, as he was certainly the grandest and most religious, commander of his day; Tilly, who was a virgin when he died, and had heard two Masses every day of his life. Shakespeare unrolled many panoramas of history, but he never gazed on one so striking as that which began with the campaigns of Tilly and closed with those of Condé and Turenne, and which resulted in the eclipse of the Spanish policy of Charles V. by that of Richelieu and Mazarin. The Thirty Years' War was the real end of the Middle Age, the end of that death agony which began with the crime of Philip the Fair at Anagni, and the consequence of which was to be the dissolution of the political and social organization which the Catholic Church had imposed upon the *Populus Christianus*—the Christian Republic. This war, strongly but penetratingly observes one of the most brilliant writers of modern France, and a judicious polemic, “issued from the cowl which Luther had trampled under his feet, was a deliverance of the world from the conditions in which it had been placed by the Catholic Church and the Christian royalties; and, of course, such a gain warrants its glorification. This war was the Last Judgment, the Valley of Jehosaphat, of the Middle Age; it was the

resurrection of man, who had been suffocated by God for centuries, as though buried in a sepulchre; and at last man rose out of the ruins of God to put himself in the place of God. It was, in fine, a beginning of a realization of the frightful dream of Jean Paul (Richter), which we have seen actuated: 'There is no God; there is no Christ'; with this difference, however, that the souls in the dream of Jean Paul are desolate—eternally desolate—while modern souls are content, happy in their joys of hell."¹ Such a war will ever be interesting to the student of humanity, and its interest increases in presence of those wars which have lately convulsed Europe, and in presence of those changes which have been recently experienced by the states which formed the German empire of the seventeenth century. But in presenting a succinct sketch of the Thirty Years' War, and a few apposite reflections, to the consideration of the curious, we are chiefly actuated by a desire to enable the reader to judge intelligently as to the legitimacy of the claims to apotheosis which many zealous Protestants advanced, a few months ago, on the occasion of the third centennial anniversary of his birth, as enjoyed by Gustavus Adolphus.²

The Latin and Germanic races, united for an instant by Charlemagne, separated when that emperor died; the Latin following its destiny in Italy, France, and Spain, while the Germanic retained, together with the imperial crown, about two-thirds of the Carolingian Empire. In the sixteenth century Germany was a federative empire, composed of both hereditary and elective monarchies and of free imperial cities, which were veritable republics. The hereditary monarchies were governed by lay sovereigns, the elective by ecclesiastical princes, generally issued from powerful noble families. Over all these states, and uniting them together, reigned the Holy Roman Emperor, an elective sovereign who was not a lawful emperor until his election was confirmed by the founder of the empire, the Pope; and who, during the three previous centuries, had nearly always been chosen from among the members of the House of Hapsburg. Just as the prince-bishops were elected

¹ Barbey d'Aurevilly, *Les Oeuvres et Les Hommes*, vol. viii., p. 108, Paris, 1887.

² The student who desires detailed information concerning the Thirty Years' War should consult the works of Gindely, Ranke, Opel, Hurter, and Schreiber for the Palatine and Danish periods; those of Gfrörer and Droysen for the Swedish period; and those of Bougeant, Barthold, and Koch for the French period. He will also consult with profit the *History of Louis XIII.*, by Levassor; and the *Memoirs of Richelieu*. Valuable aid will be obtained in the biography of Tilly, by Klopp; in that of Wallenstein, by Ranke; in that of Mansfeld, by Villermont; and in that of Turenne, by Ramsay. The *Storia Universale* of Cantù gives probably the most impartial and satisfactory of all the succinct narratives. Among the more voluminous works treating especially of this subject, none can be compared with the *Histoire de La Guerre de Trente Ans*, by Charveriat (Paris, 1878), for erudition, grasp of subject, and historical acumen.

by the cathedral-chapters, so the emperor was chosen by seven electors. Three of these electors were ecclesiastics, the archbishops of Mayence, Cologne, and Treves; and the lay electors were the Count-Palatine, the King of Bohemia, the Duke of Saxony, and the Margrave of Brandenburg.

The so-called Reformation produced in Germany political as well as religious convulsions. When a lay prince became a Protestant, no change occurred in the government of his states; since the power continued to be transmitted by way of heredity. But when the sovereign was an ecclesiastic, his perversion to Protestantism necessarily entailed a radical modification of the political constitution of his states; for the first act of a priest, when he had discovered the errors of popery, was an abandonment of celibacy, and therefore a transformation of his elective into a hereditary principality. A striking instance of the consequences of the apostasy of an ecclesiastical ruler may be discerned in the case of Albert of Brandenburg, a soldier-monk and grand-master of the Teutonic Knights, who became a "reformer," and by stealing the property of his order, laid the foundation of the Protestant kingdom of Prussia. When the pervert was also an imperial elector, the constitution of the empire was affected; for then, since three of the electors had embraced Protestantism, the majority in the electoral college passed to the innovators, and there was a danger of an elevation of a heretic to the imperial throne—an anomaly for which humanity was not prepared, and the actuation of which would have sapped the very foundation of the venerated institution. After thirty years of discord, Germany, exhausted by the wars of Charles V., was desirous of peace, even at the cost of an abandonment of religious controversy. On February 5, 1555, a Diet assembled at Augsburg, and a kind of peace was concluded between the Catholics and Lutherans; the Calvinists, Zwinglians, and other sectarians being excluded, and declared unable to profit by any of the concessions made by the Catholics. Those princes who had adopted the Confession of Augsburg, as well as the Catholic princes and free states, were to enjoy a species of freedom of conscience; that is, they could be either Catholics or Lutherans. The Evangelicals—so termed, after the fashion of *lucus a non lucendo*, because they paid more attention to the Old Testament than to the Gospel—were utterly ignored in this transaction. The Lutheran princes and states were to retain possession of all the ecclesiastical domains which they had stolen before the treaty of Passau in 1552. The reader will observe that liberty of conscience, or what passed for such, was here granted to princes and to the administrators of the free cities; that is, to sovereigns, and not to subjects, of whom there was no thought in the premises.

Each sovereign was to impose on his people whatever religion accorded with his conviction or suited his caprice, in actuation of the detestable and pre-eminently Protestant principle—in reality, a pagan canon—that the master of a country was, of right, master also of that country's religion; *Cujus regio, ejus religio*.¹ The aggrieved subjects, however, had one resource; they could sell their property, and if they were then able to pay for the privilege, they could emigrate. After the Peace of Augsburg, Protestantism made great progress in Germany. Hitherto it had been confined to Saxony, Franconia, and Suabia; but now it penetrated into Westphalia, Bavaria, and the duchy of Austria. Among the princely families, only three remained Catholic; those of Austria, Bavaria, and Juliers Cleves-Berg. And even these made many concessions to such of their subjects as became Protestants. Even the ecclesiastical princes gave full toleration to their heretical subjects. At the request of the emperor Ferdinand I., in hopes of preventing further apostacies, Pope Pius IV. accorded, in 1564, the use of the chalice to lay communicants in the duchy of Austria. Of course this concession encouraged the demand of others; and Maximilian II. requested Pope Pius V. to sanction the marriage of the clergy. The Pontiff most energetically refused.² Such was the condition of Germany in 1612, when Mathias became emperor. Feeling that his advanced age would not allow him to confront satisfactorily the difficulties of his position, Mathias procured the recognition of his cousin, Ferdinand of Styria, as King of Bohemia in 1617, and as king of Hungary in 1618. This action was equivalent to a proclamation that Ferdinand was to be the next emperor; and as that prince was a zealous Catholic, the Protestants anticipated danger for themselves, and resolved to forestall it. An occasion for action was furnished by a prohibition to erect Protestant temples in his domains, issued by the archbishop of Prague, in accordance with that very Protestant maxim that each ruler should be the guide of his people in religious matters. Led by Count Mathias of Thurn, the Protestants of Bohemia arose in revolt; and the "defenestration" of Prague—the pitching of several royal councillors out of a window, sixty feet from the ground,

¹ This principle was promulgated by nearly all the Protestant juriconsults of that day. The celebrated Hugo Grotius contended: "In arbitrio est summi imperii quænam religio publice exerceatur; idque præcipuum inter majestatis jura ponunt omnes qui politica scripserunt." Certainly this was the most complete of tyrannies, if applied in the fulness of its consequences, and not restrained by the written constitutions which men were obliged to devise as makeshifts, when they had abolished the supreme guardian of justice and of right.

² Pfister, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. vii., p. 463; Ranke, *Zur Deutschen Geschichte*, p. 25; Barre, *Histoire d'Allemagne*, vol. ix., p. 90.

so that blood might not be shed in the council-chamber—was the signal for the Thirty Years' War.

The first period of this war, or series of wars, is generally styled the Palatine Period, because of the prominent part taken in it by the Elector-Palatine Frederick V., a weak and yet ambitious prince whom the Bohemian rebels acclaimed as their king; and who was recommended to their appreciation by his triple position of head of the Protestant League, nephew of the stadtholder of Holland, and son-in-law of the royal theologian, James I. of England. In the ensuing contest, Ferdinand was succored by the Duke of Bavaria, a zealous Catholic; and by the elector of Saxony, a Lutheran, but therefore an enemy of the Calvinists, who were the mainstay of the early rebels. The Palatine was conquered; the defeat of Calvinism was complete; but although the emperor triumphed, he excited the ire of the Lutherans by occupying the palatinate, and above all, by conferring the electoral dignity on a Catholic prince. The Palatine, because of his revolt and usurpation, had undoubtedly merited to be placed under the ban of the empire, and had certainly forfeited his estates; but the emperor should not have disposed of the electoral dignity without the concurrence of the electoral college. This seizure of the hereditary states of the Palatine, and the transfer of the electorate to the Bavarian, became the chief pretexts for the continuance of the war; for although the electors ratified the Bavarian's elevation to their circle, their action was more or less compulsory.

During this first period of the war, which lasted from 1618 to 1623, England and Holland gave some aid to the Palatine; Spain naturally supported Austria, for their crowns were worn by near kinsmen, and their interests were supposed to be identical; France was neutral, but was then more favorable to the Hapsburgs than to their adversaries. When the Palatine period of the war terminated with an apparent triumph of the emperor and of Catholicism, the Protestants everywhere took the alarm; and German Calvinists especially feared for the tenure of the dominions and estates which they had stolen from Catholic ecclesiastics. They renewed the contest; and the Danish monarch, who also coveted the goods of the Church, placed himself at their head, incited and supported by France and England. But like the Palatine, the Dane was beaten; and although the Treaty of Lubeck restored to him his hereditary dominions, he was forced to abandon his German allies. The emperor, foreseeing no obstacles, now published, on March 6, 1629, his famous Edict of Restitution. As we have observed, the Peace of Augsburg, in 1555, had allowed the Lutherans to retain the ecclesiastical domains and properties which they had "annexed" before the Peace of Passau, in 1552. But while

sanctioning these usurpations, the Peace of Augsburg had pronounced that thereafter when a bishop, abbot, or beneficed clergyman apostatized, he should, by the fact, lose his bishopric, abbey, or benefice; and this clause was called the "ecclesiastical reservation." However, in spite of this reservation, the usurpations had continued; and the ecclesiastical princes often called upon the emperor to enforce its observation. The immediate successors of Ferdinand I., not very hostile to Protestantism, had paid no attention to these demands; but things changed with the advent of Ferdinand II., and by the Edict of Restitution the Protestants were forced to restore the domains of two archbishoprics, Magdeburg and Bremen, and of twelve bishoprics, to say nothing of an immense number of exspoliated abbeys and convents. In Saxony alone, the reformers were obliged to relinquish their sacrilegious grasp on 120 abbeys and convents, besides many houses of mendicant friars.¹ This measure, so irritating to hundreds of Protestant nobles and upstarts who had begun to assume some prominence, owing to their acquisition of the goods of the sanctuary, was destined to figure among the pretexts alleged by Gustavus Adolphus in justification of his interference in German affairs.² It is painful to have to notice, in this connection, that a large number of these recovered properties, instead of being restored to their rightful owners, or of being used for religious or educational purposes, fell into the hands of Catholic laymen; and in 1632 Pope Urban VIII. declared that the torments inflicted on Germany by the Swedes were in punishment of this scandal.³ After the enforcement of the Edict of Restitution, the growing power of the emperor, and the tyrannies of Wallenstein, frightened even the Catholics; and, therefore, they joined the Protestants in demanding the dismissal of the noble *condottiere*. Ferdinand relied on the Catholics for the election of his son as "king of the Romans" (and, therefore, future emperor); and he unwillingly ordered his arrogant commander to retire to his estates. Many writers attribute the fall of Wallenstein, and also the refusal of the electors to accommodate Ferdinand in the promotion of his son, to the influence of the agent of Richelieu, the celebrated "grey cardinal," the Capuchin, Joseph (François LeClerc de Tremblay). But it is certain that the electors had decided on asking for the dismissal of Wallenstein, and on refusing the election of the "king of the Romans," before Father Joseph arrived at Ratisbon, where the

¹ Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II.*, vol. iii., p. 30.

² Hurter, *Ibi.*, pp. 28, 41. Heyne, *Der Kurfürstentag zu Regensburg von 1630*, p. 167.

³ Hurter, *Ibi.*, pp. 71, 74.

discussions were held. The rôle of the Capuchin at the Diet of Ratisbon was simply that of a peacemaker.¹

The House of Austria was now called to confront a new adversary, the king of Sweden; and France was to support him more actively than she had the Danish monarch.

This period of the Thirty Years' War claims more attention than we have considered necessary to devote to the Palatine and Danish periods; for the Lion of the North, the "king of snows," is almost venerated by the average Protestant. Were Protestantism capable of making saints, and having made them, of conscientiously praying to them, Gustavus Adolphus would have been canonized. On December 9, 1594, in the castle of Stockholm, a son was born to Charles, duke of Sudermania, the third son of that king, Gustavus Wasa, who had introduced Protestantism into Sweden.² In remembrance of this monarch, and of his maternal grandfather, Adolphus of Holstein, the babe was christened as Gustavus Adolphus. Ten years before this event, the famous Danish astronomer (and astrologist), Tycho-Brahe, had discovered a new star in the constellation of Cassiopea; and it was said, when Gustavus Adolphus appeared, that the scientist had declared that the heavenly birth prognosticated the coming of a northern prince who was to be the saviour of the then nascent and persecuted "Protestant Church." Charles of Sudermania mounted the Swedish throne in 1604; and one of his chief cares was the careful education of his heir. Besides his paternal language, the young prince learned to use fluently the Latin, Italian, French, German, and Dutch tongues; and when he had attained to the age of eleven, his father made him assist at the sessions of the council of State and at the reception of ambassadors. In 1611 the death of Charles IX. made Gustavus Adolphus king of Sweden; and one of his first acts was the appointment of his former tutor, Axel Oxenstierna,

¹ Heyne, *loc. cit.*, pp. 134-137. Charverlat, *Histoire de la Guerre de Trente Ans*, vol. i., pp. 538-544.

² The Treaty of Calmar, 1397, had united Sweden, Norway, and Denmark under one crown, although each of these Scandinavian kingdoms retained its own liberties and privileges. But the Swedes refused to be bound by the agreement, and during the fifteenth century they were governed by administrators chosen from the family of the Sture. Christian II. of Denmark endeavored to restore the union of the three kingdoms; and as Pope Leo X. supported his claims, the Swedes became hostile to the Holy See. When Christian returned to Denmark, after his conquest of Sweden, Gustavus Ericson, one of the noble family of the Wasa, headed a revolt, was proclaimed administrator, and finally became king of Sweden, in 1523, under the name of Gustavus Wasa. The discontent of the Swedes with Pope Leo X. encouraged Wasa to seize the property of the Church in order to replete his exhausted treasury; and as an excuse, he found that the true gospel had just been announced at Wittenberg.—Gfrörer, *Gustav-Adolph, König von Schweden, und Seine Zeit*, Stuttgart, 1863. Droysen, *Gustaf Adolf*, Leipsig, 1869.

to the royal chancellorship. To the day of his death he showed the utmost confidence in this faithful servant. Gustavus Adolphus was an intense absolutist. Until he ascended the throne, the Swedish Diets had assembled regularly, and had shared the initiative with the monarch. But the young king ordained that thereafter he alone should enjoy this prerogative; the Diet having merely the privilege of respectfully presenting a remonstrance at the close of the session. Again, hitherto the royal power had been limited not only by the Diet, but by the Reichsrath or council of the kingdom, which was composed of the leading nobles, and had always been accustomed to deliberate with the sovereign on all important matters. Gustavus allowed this body to subsist in name; but he consulted, when he cared to do so, and only then, five special councils—those of justice, war, marine, foreign affairs, and finance—every member of which was designated by himself. Gustavus Wasa had already deprived the clergy of much of their authority and influence; but Gustavus Adolphus resolved to render his ministers docile creatures of his royal will. He instituted a consistory, so composed that he might always rely upon the subservience of the majority to any desire or whim of his Majesty. This sycophantic body appointed all the pastors, exercised over printed matter a rigid censorship which the Roman Index would have admired rather than imitated, and presided over all literary and eleemosynary institutions. As to religious liberty, the mind of Gustavus Adolphus, like that of every Protestant prince of his day, harbored but one idea on the subject; it was the duty and the privilege of his subjects to profess the creed which their royal master might chance to adopt as his own. Immediately on his accession, the Diet of Nyköping agreed with its lord that Lutheranism was to be maintained in Sweden, even though extreme measures were necessary for that end; and in 1617 the Diet of Oebro obeyed the royal will by decreeing that the penalty for high treason should be visited upon every Swede who, even in the privacy of his own house, and only in the bosom of his family, would be guilty of any Catholic practices. In fact, many persons, and in 1623 three public functionaries, mounted the scaffold in accordance with this law.¹ In fine, with the advent of Gustavus Adolphus, all the institutions of the Middle Ages vanished from Sweden, and the government became an absolute monarchy, without a vestige of either civil or religious liberty.

The sole object of Gustavus Adolphus was to augment his kingdom, and to dominate. The Swedes were for him merely so many instruments for the advancement of his glory. He continued the

¹ Gfrörer, *loc cit.*, pp. 70, 109, 125.

policy of his family, the acquisition of the Baltic regions, and a consequent conversion of that sea into a Swedish lake. In 1629, after long and cruel wars, he possessed all the Baltic shores, excepting those of Denmark, Mecklenburg, and Pomerania. The greater part of the still coveted territory was a dependency of the Holy Roman Empire, at the head of which was the House of Austria, then the most powerful in Christendom. But Germany was divided by the greed for ecclesiastical property and domains; and the emperor had alienated the Protestants by his Edict of Restitution—a measure which was perfectly legal and otherwise legitimate, since it simply ordered the observance of the Peace of Augsburg, when it enjoined upon the Protestants a surrender of goods which they had seized in violation of that treaty. However, this edict was an act of bad policy on the part of Ferdinand; for it lost for him the support of many of the German princes, especially that of the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, the former of whom had ever been warmly attached to the House of Hapsburg. While this fever agitated Germany, Gustavus Adolphus determined to actuate his dream of Baltic conquest.

At this period, France had resolved to perfect, to “round out” her frontiers by the annexation of Alsace, and to diminish the power of Austria by procuring the transfer of the imperial crown to the House of Bavaria. Therefore, since France and Sweden had a common adversary, it was natural for them to unite; and Richelieu thought that when Gustavus had served his purpose, he could easily withdraw from the alliance. By the influence of the cardinal, the war between Sweden and Poland was terminated by the armistice of Altmark; and Gustavus was then free to attend to Germany. The ambitious monarch had no justification for interfering in German affairs; and he was so well convinced of this fact, that he did not dare to assemble the Swedish Diet in order to go through the farce of asking its opinion as to the advisability of declaring war. He simply informed some of the most docile members of his sufficiently docile council that a state of war “already subsisted” between the Empire and Sweden, and that the sole question for consideration was, as to which of the parties should make the attack.¹ Nothing was more certain than that the emperor Ferdinand had in no way menaced Sweden; if he had thought of creating an imperial fleet in the Baltic, it was merely for the defeat of Denmark. Gustavus vaunted himself as the defender of the German princes, but none of these had asked his aid; the duke of Pomerania had even begged him to stay away from Germany. It is interesting to note that Frederick II.,

¹ Richelieu, *Memoires*, vol. v., p. 147. Gforer, *loc. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 134.

of Prussia, who was not at all scrupulous about the ethics of conquest, after detailing the complaints of Gustavus against the emperor, declared that "none of these reasons could justify the arming of nations against each other, the ruination of the most flourishing provinces, and a prodigal effusion of human blood, in order to satisfy the ambition and caprice of one man."¹ That he might the more successfully pose as the offended and innocent party, Gustavus affected to consider Germany and Sweden as having been placed already in a state of hostility by the emperor's interference in Poland; and therefore, he did not deign to declare war—a course which was unprecedented in those days. At that time, statesmen were more punctilious, to say the least, than they are in our day; then, the world would have been astounded had a king of Sardinia invaded the territories of the Pope and of the king of the Two Sicilies, without the formality of a declaration of war. Whether or not Gustavus Adolphus, like many of the *condottieri* of his time, preserved something of the gentleman even amid the ruffianliness of the brigand, he seems to have felt the necessity of excusing his filibustering conduct; for he caused trusty agents to scatter throughout Europe copies of a manifesto written in Latin, entitled, "Reasons why the king of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, has been forced to disembark on German soil with an army." They who would fain regard the royal adventurer as an angel of the Most High, bearing the flaming sword of a Macchabee in defence of the persecuted children of God, will perforce observe that the sentiments of this justificatory document are of the earth, earthy. "The king of Sweden has done all that he could to prevent this war (an absolute falsehood). He has long closed his ears to the urgent appeals (which did not exist) of his relatives and his co-religionists in Germany, because he still hoped that the emperor would cease to persecute these innocents (Ferdinand had persecuted no one). But he finds himself obliged by the strongest of reasons (greed of territory), to obtain by the sword that satisfaction which has been refused to his prayers. The imperialists have intercepted his letters (which was their right) to the prince of Transylvania, Bethlen Gabor, (a sworn vassal of the Turk, and usurper of the crown of Hungary), and maltreated the messenger. The emperor has fomented discord between Sweden and Poland, and has furnished two armies to king Sigismund (to aid this prince against an iniquitous invasion). . . . He has tried to dominate the Baltic, which is a violation of the rights of Sweden, to which country, in common with Denmark, that sea

¹ *Œuvres de Frederic II.*, edition 1789, vol. i, p. 55. Koch, *loc. cit.*, in Introduction, p. 7.

has always belonged (a new clause in the law of nations). . . . under the pretence of punishing rebels, and of causing a restitution of ecclesiastical property, the emperor has oppressed all the princes of Germany, and has tried to force them under his yoke (Ferdinand merely upheld the German constitution). The emperor has rejected all my propositions of peace (which were purposely so couched that no German patriot could accept them); and nothing remains for the king of Sweden but war in order to obtain justice (a Scandinaldo-German empire)." In this manifesto, the alleged Macchabee scarcely alludes to religious questions. Indeed, he caused the Genevan professor, Spanheim, to compose a work in proof of the fact that his Swedish majesty was not undertaking a religious war.¹

Gustavus Adolphus owed his first successes in Germany to the excellence of his troops, inured to hardship and thoroughly drilled in his Polish campaigns. Nor should it be forgotten that the Swede alone directed his army, as he did his policy; whereas Ferdinand could effect nothing without the concurrence of the electors. Complete unity fought for the former; perpetual discord harassed the latter. But in spite of these advantages, Gustavus remained for six months without doing anything but occupy the mouths of the Oder; then the treaty of Berwald, concluded with France, enabled him to capture Frankfort, and thus to master the entire river. Compelling his brother-in-law, the elector of Brandenburg, to a less than half-hearted alliance, he obtained control of the basin of the Elbe. The elector of Saxony, frightened by the Edict of Restitution, was as yet neutral; but when Tilly summoned him, in the name of the emperor, to lay down his arms, he perforce joined the Swede. This alliance was decisive for Gustavus. Having no longer any fear for his rear, he pushed forward and vanquished Tilly at Leipsic, thanks to the disobedience of Pappenheim more than to the unwieldiness of the imperial army, still hampered by the now antiquated Spanish tactics. Gustavus could now have advanced to Vienna, but he preferred to wait for reinforcements; meanwhile invading Franconia and the ecclesiastical electorates of the Rhine. Had he been animated, as is asserted *usque ad nauseam*, by the sole desire of saving German Protestantism, he would have marched on the Austrian capital immediately after his victory at Leipsic; for, in order to checkmate him, the emperor would have abrogated the Edict of Restitution, which, indeed, had been renounced so far as Saxony was concerned. But then Gustavus would have returned to his kingdom of snow with naught but glory for his profit. There would

¹ *Mercure Francais*, vol. xvi., pt. 2, p. 297.

have remained no further need for his presence in Germany; and if he attempted to annex any German soil, the now contented Protestants would have joined the Catholics in driving him beyond the Baltic. Gustavus entertained no idea of being content with the reputation of a Protestant Macchabee; and since he was not yet sufficiently powerful to wrest any concession of territory from the emperor, he seized upon what was at his mercy, the ecclesiastical states on the Main and the Rhine. At this juncture he illustrated his views on the matter of religious toleration. Erfurt, then a populous city, was a dependency of the archbishop-elect of Mayence; but this prelate had always allowed it to govern itself in an independence similar to that of the imperial free cities. Under the protection of the archbishop-elect, the Protestant maxim of *Cujus regio, etc.*, had never been actuated. The Lutherans had been allowed to live in peace with their fellow-citizens. But when this alleged champion of religious liberty entered Erfurt he issued a pronunciamiento declaring that all Catholics were excluded from his favor, and he heeded the prayers of the municipal council not to expel all the priests, only on condition that these should swear lasting fidelity to the king of Sweden. Then he decreed that all the Protestant ministers and university professors should be exempted from war taxes; but he levied a double quota on the Catholic clergy.¹

The successes of Gustavus Adolphus alarmed Richelieu, who had wished to lessen the power of Austria, but in favor of France and Bavaria, Catholic powers, rather than the aggrandizement of Protestant Sweden. Therefore, the sagacious cardinal-minister insisted that Gustavus should spare the Catholic League—that is, the Catholic princes of Germany. But the Swedish monarch would make no distinction between the emperor and the Catholic princes, and his good fortune rendered him impatient of Richelieu's dictation. He even threatened to attack France. Then Richelieu withdrew his subsidies; but Gustavus felt the loss scarcely at all, having then at his command the resources of the richest parts of Germany. Meanwhile the command of the imperial army had been restored to Wallenstein. Perceiving that his enemy was menacing his communications with the north, Gustavus concentrated his forces near Nuremberg, and finally, on November 16, 1632, he defeated Wallenstein at Lutzen, but perished on the field.² Had the Lion of the North survived the battle

¹ Klopp, *Tilly*, vol. ii., p. 343; Gfrörer, *loc. cit.*, p. 671.

² Duke Francis Albert of Saxe-Lauenburg, who was with Gustavus during nearly the whole of the battle, has been accused of assassinating him. But the testimony of the royal page, August Leubelfing, and of the royal chamberlain, Truchsess, both of whom were in immediate attendance on Gustavus at the fatal moment, shows that the

of Lutzen, would he have remained contented with the foundation of a Scandinavian empire entirely enclosing the Baltic? Or would he have mounted the throne of Germany? Certainly there were many in Germany who talked at that time of placing on his brow the imperial crown. But had he attempted the latter project he would have failed; for not only would he have encountered a Franco-Hispano-Austrian opposition, but he would have had to withstand the enmity of even the Protestants of Germany, whom Ferdinand would assuredly have conciliated by a revocation of the Edict of Restitution. Already the elector of Saxony had refused to aid him at Lutzen, and had formed the design of heading a third party for the purpose of forcing a peace between Sweden and the empire.

Not for a moment had Gustavus Adolphus any intention to establish in Germany either civil or religious liberty. If he delivered the German princes from the suzerainty of their emperor, it was to impose upon them one which was still more severe, since it had no limit or criterion but his own will. As to religious liberty, no prince of the day clung with such tenacity to the soul-enthraling maxim of *Cujus regio*; and if he did not apply the principle in Germany with as much zeal as he had exhibited in Sweden, it was because of his need of the friendship of Richelieu. His admirers are probably correct in their estimate of the sincerity of their hero as a Lutheran; but precisely because of that sincerity, he could have favored no system of religious equality. Whenever he did manifest some show of justice to German Catholics, it was because the politician momentarily dominated the fanatic. Gustavus Adolphus used religion as a means for the increase of his earthly power—for the foundation of a Scandinavian empire; and in actuating his design, he certainly displayed great craft as a statesman, and consummate ability as a general. As a general, he introduced a revolution in military tactics; he rendered his army more manageable than any other; his artillery was lighter in the handling, and more numerous; his genius on the field was great. Probably he was really pious; but his fondness for preaching and psalm-singing savored of cant. It was a good stroke of policy for Gustavus, when about to leave his icy regions in order to seek his fortune with the aid of the millions of Richelieu, to vaunt himself the envoy of the Most High. Alaric, Attila, Mohammed, Cromwell, and other formidable mystics, have always insisted upon a

ball which he received in the back came from the imperial cuirassiers, who had surrounded him and his staff, and out of whose ranks he was trying to cut his way. Unhorsed, he extended his hands for relief to Leubelfing, and as the page was trying to raise him from the ground, a cuirassier shot him through the head.—Gfrörer, *loc. cit.*, p. 786; Mauvillon, *Histoire de Gustave-Adolphe*, p. 572.

divine vocation when about to appropriate the things of earth; and as Gustavus was of the same mould, he did well in posing as a Judas Macchabeus. But we can scarcely suppose a Macchabeus guilty of such mendacious hypocrisy as that manifested by Gustavus Adolphus when he bade farewell to the Estates of Sweden: "Let no one believe that I precipitate myself into this war without good reason. I call the Omnipotent God, in whose presence I speak, to witness that I do not fight for my own pleasure. I am forced to the combat. The emperor has offended me in the gravest manner. He aids my enemies; he persecutes my co-religionists, the Protestants of Germany, who are groaning under the yoke of the Pope, and who extend toward me their suppliant hands. . . . Before separating from you, I invoke upon you the protection of the Almighty; and you especially, valiant nobles, I recommend to the divine protection. *Be worthy descendants of the ancient Goths!*" But whether the piety of Gustavus Adolphus was sincere or feigned, it is certain that his impartial contemporaries regarded him as a politician rather than as a devotee. Pope Urban VIII. would never discern in him the declared adversary of the Catholic Church; he persisted in regarding the Swedish monarch as merely the foe of the House of Austria; and it was said that when the news of the king's death reached the Vatican, the Pontiff offered Mass for the departed soul.¹ The private life of Gustavus Adolphus, if compared with that of most Protestant princes of his day, was exemplary; he seems to have cherished but one immoral intimacy, and that one did not last for a long time. Glory was the chief love of his inmost heart; but it is certain that in order to satisfy his passion, he could forget his solemn promises, and that his interests were often considered before the dictates of justice.²

After the death of Gustavus Adolphus, the Swedes and German Protestants lost ground; they were beaten at Nordlingen, and the House of Austria recovered its power. By the Treaty of Prague, May 30, 1635, the emperor drew to his side many of the Protestants; and his authority became as great as it had been after the defeats of the palatine and of the Danish king. But at the moment when nothing seemed to thwart his triumph, France called upon him to halt. Hitherto, Richelieu had combated Austria in merely an indirect manner; now he declared open war. Then ensued the most brilliant period of the Thirty Years' War, illustra-

¹ Droysen, *loc. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 665. Richelieu, in his *Memoirs*, merely says: "When the Pope heard this news, he went to the national church of the Germans, and celebrated a low mass."

² For instance, his treatment of the palatine, his invasion of Pomerania, and his compulsion of the elector of Brandenburg to the alliance.

ted on the part of France, by *le grand Condé* and Turenne, and on the part of Austria and Spain, by the Italians, Montecuculli and Piccolomini. The struggle was an alternation of successes and reverses on both sides. For an instant the Austrians and Spaniards invaded France; but were repelled before they could reach Paris. Then the French and Swedes transferred the war to Germany, but they could not penetrate to Vienna. Little by little, exhaustion was entailed by the gigantic efforts put forth by both parties, and despite the stubborn opposition of Spain, Austria resolved to make peace. Like nearly all the treaties of modern times, the Peace of Westphalia was not inspired by principle. Convenience, not justice, was the thing sought. "Accomplished facts," which some innocents deem the discovery of Napoleon III. and Lord Palmerston, had been already consecrated by the Peace of Augsburg, in the permission accorded to the Protestants to retain the goods of the Church which they had stolen before the year 1552; and the Peace of Westphalia repeated the consecration by allowing the thieves to retain what they had annexed before 1624. Whatever could be obtained was demanded; nothing was ceded that could be withheld or recovered. The unity of the Holy Roman Empire in Germany was weakened, inasmuch as the emperor lost much of his power, to the profit of the German sovereigns. The treaty pleased no one. The Catholics lamented the loss of much ecclesiastical dominion and property; and the Protestants were irritated by the prohibition to purloin any more. The ratifications of the treaty were exchanged in 1649, in spite of the efforts of Chigi, the papal nuncio at Vienna. In January, 1651, Pope Innocent X., in his Bull *Zelus Domus Dei*, protested against the usurpation of ecclesiastical goods, and declared the treaty null. In fact, the signatories had exceeded their powers in suppressing bishoprics without the consent of the Holy See, and in disposing of goods which did not belong to them. The Pope alone regarded the rights of things; the signers looked upon everything from a point of view, the basis of which was brute force.¹ One of the chief results of the Peace of Westphalia was the loss by Germany of that primacy which she had enjoyed in the Middle Ages. The Germans had feared the supremacy of the Latin race, and hence, if for no other reason, many of them had espoused the cause of the Reformation: and hence, also, they combated Spain, and Spain being Catholic, they warred also on Catholicism. But they succeeded only in consolidating the House of Austria, which thenceforward until our days retained a supre-

¹ Bougeant, *Historie du Traité de Westphalle*, vol. iii., p. 631. Ranke, *Die Römischen Papste*, vol. ii., p. 566.

macy in Germany, and an overwhelming share in the dominion of Italy. As Cantù observes: "Instead of abolishing the empire, the Germans abolished the Pope; instead of acquiring civil and municipal liberty, they obtained the privilege of not going to Mass or to confession, and of singing the Psalms in German. Italy suffered still more; her fruitful division into little states disappearing before the Austro-Spanish domination which was no longer counterbalanced by France, although this domination was compelled to some degree of restraint by the republics of Venice and Genoa."¹

The Peace of Westphalia was the first compact entered into by the European powers in accordance with the new *jus publicum*, based upon the idea of a material balance of power. Thirty years of unprofitable slaughter, and of indiscriminate destruction of nearly all civilizing agencies,² had convinced sovereigns that for some time, neither Catholicism nor heresy would attain a securely dominant position, and by the famous treaty they agreed on mutual toleration. Then Protestantism acquired a legal existence in a large part of Europe, and Rome began to fear that the days of heresy were to be long in those regions. But the chief reason for which Pope Innocent X. reprobated the Peace of Westphalia was found in its sanction of that absolutely pagan canon that the sovereign of a country is, of right, the master and sole *ratio essendi* of that country's religion. With this principle legally sanctioned and enforced, it is no wonder that an end was put for a time to the Catholic renaissance which had followed the celebration of the Council of Trent. But the temporal dominion of the Roman Pontiff in the States of the Church obtained some advantages at this time. Urban VIII. recovered Montefeltro, Urbino, Pesaro and Sinigaglia, and he firmly resisted the efforts of his nephews to obtain these territories in fief.

And now a word about the position occupied during the Thirty Years' War by two prominent churchmen, Pope Urban VIII. and Cardinal Richelieu; for any commentary upon the career of Gustavus Adolphus would be incomplete without such notice. Urban VIII. deemed it his duty, both as pontiff and as temporal sovereign, to take an active part in the politics of his time. In considering the questions which then divided Germany into two hostile

¹ *Eretici d'Italia*. Discourse 47.

² The Holy See succeeded in saving from amid the devastations of the Thirty Years' War the great Palatine Library of Heidelberg, which was transported to Rome, and afterward, in 1815, restored. We may here note that although Rome fulfilled her part of the agreement of the Congress of Vienna concerning the restoration of objects of art, etc., to their rightful owners, many of her own artistic and literary properties were retained in various capitals.

parties, and which entailed a bloody rivalry between France and the House of Hapsburg, the Pope thought it proper to pronounce against Austria and Spain. Like nearly all of his predecessors in the papal chair, Urban VIII. dreaded any increase of the imperial power in Italy. In pursuance of a policy which was both natural and proper in a Pope, he allied himself with France in the question of the Valtelline, an Italian valley parallel with the Engaddine, through which flows the Adda as far as the Lake of Como, between two mountain ranges, which separate it from Venice on the south and from the Grisons on the north. All Europe was at this time convulsed because of this little valley, for its position gave to its occupier immense strategic advantages. The Hapsburgs were dominant in Germany; a branch of the family reigned in Spain, in the Milanese and in Naples, and in most of the New World. Was the Valtelline to become a Spanish possession? Then it would be a road for an army from Germany into Italy; let the Swiss and the Grisons espouse which side they would. France, quite naturally, coveted the Valtelline, if for no other reason than to check the power of Austria. Then there were the Grisons, sustained by Switzerland, Holland, and more or less openly by England. No wonder, therefore, that Urban VIII. sided with France. The great Richelieu was then at the head of affairs in the land of the Lilies, and he so shaped his anti-Austrian policy that many of his best friends reproved him for acting contrary to the interests of the Church. It is not for us to apologize for his action in allying the Eldest Daughter of the Church with a monarch whose triumph could not but be detrimental to Catholicism. He certainly felt ashamed of his policy, and shed tears of compunction when deciding upon it in full council. He thought to cover his shame under the papal mantle, by trying to obtain at least an indirect sanction for his diplomacy from the Pontiff. The imperial arms had triumphed in Germany, an army was about to act in Poland against the Swedes, and the Spaniards had furnished another for service against the Netherlanders; another force was to attack the Duke of Mantua, then under the protection of France. Wallenstein, the man who gives history so many surprises, was so enraged at Pope Urban for his non-approval of the Edict of Restitution, that he urged the emperor to send an expedition against Rome—another one of the many undertaken by a German imperial army—saying that as a century had passed since the emperor Charles V. had sacked the papal capital, the booty would now be of immense value. At this juncture Richelieu concluded his alliance with Gustavus Adolphus, providing, however, that the Swede should promise to tolerate the Catholic religion wherever he found it. The emperor loudly complained of the pontifical

refusal to condemn directly the contract between the cardinal and the Swedish king, and of the hesitancy of the Holy See in pronouncing the war a religious war. The reclamations of Ferdinand II. were presented to the Pontiff by Pazmany, archbishop of Gran, and were supported in full consistory by the Spanish envoy, Cardinal Borgia, who went so far as to reproach the Pope with a culpable indifference toward the true interests of the Catholic Church.¹ The Sacred College was divided as to the course to be pursued, and prompted by Cardinal Ludovisi, some of their Eminences even advised the convocation of a General Council to consider the matter. It is evident that, unlike all Protestant historians, Urban VIII. did not regard the Thirty Years' War as one of religion, but rather as one of worldly interests. The same may be said of Richelieu, who intended to cast Gustavus Adolphus aside, so soon as he had served the purposes of France.

REUBEN PARSONS, D.D.

¹ A few years after this reproval of Urban VIII. by the imperialists, the Gallicans, more loyal to their king than to the Holy See, upbraided Innocent XI. because of his resistance to the pretensions of Louis XIV., with being not only a protector of Protestants, but a Protestant himself. It was then that Lafontaine wrote :

“Et tout le parti Protestant
Du Saint-Pere en vain très-content,
Le chevalier de Sillery
En parlant de ce Pape-cy,
Souhaitait pour la paix publique,
Qu'il se fust rendu Catholique.”

THE OPENING OF A JUDICIAL INSTRUCTION IN
ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATE DOCU-
MENT "CUM MAGNOPERE."

THE instruction of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars in 1880, more familiar to us here in the somewhat modified form given it by the Congregation of the Propaganda when sending it four years later to the bishops of the United States, has given official sanction to an important modification in official procedure.

We do not propose to study in this article the document in all its parts, our object being merely to examine it as bearing on the introduction of a case, and to see whether the famous principle of *prævia infamatio* formerly so necessary for the opening of criminal cases, still retains its full force and judicial consequences.

Before entering more fully into the subject-matter of our paper, it will be well to sketch the origin of this new discipline and to recall to mind the state of things which it comes to replace.

* * * * *

In the troubled times in which we live, consequent on the ever widening divergence which shows itself in old Catholic countries between the spirit of Christianity and the principles of indifferent or hostile legislations, the attention of the Church is drawn to the constantly increasing difficulty of maintaining a judicial procedure framed for wholly different surroundings. It is hardly necessary to add that these difficulties are found still greater when the Church is brought in contact with nations under heretical governments, or in countries like our own, whose very constitution proclaims the absolute separation of church and state.

The Catholic hierarchy is, indeed, often deprived of the means of exercising its authority over the persons, objects, or cases within its jurisdiction, or at least its action is too often hampered by the civil laws. It is thus that certain criminal cases of laymen, which according to canon law should belong to the ecclesiastical courts, are never tried there. There is no use in indulging in any useless recrimination over this—we must keep up with the times. But there are other and still greater inconveniences. Thus, the Episcopal courts find themselves in a position in which they are often unable to observe the judicial forms prescribed by law, either because they cannot summon or compel the attendance of witnesses as required, or because all enforcements by the usual sanctions of

constraint and punishment are now-a-days denied them. It is easy to imagine, how, prior to the remodelling of the judicial code of procedure such a state of things was subversive of discipline. In almost every case might be found substantial defects arising from a non-compliance with canonical requirements, and the parties interested in the case took advantage of this to dispute the judicial sentence as grounded on an irregular process; therefore, appeals to Rome, based on defects of form, were multiplied beyond all measure to the great detriment of order and peace. This deplorable state of things called for the remonstrance of the bishops who were incapable both of maintaining order in their dioceses and of enforcing the canonical remedies prescribed in the second book of the Decretals. From all sides rose a demand for a more simple judicial form; for one, which, while retaining all the salient and essential features of the old, would be free from the complicated formalities which interfered with its daily usefulness.

This appeal was not in vain. The bishops of France and Italy were the first to get authority to employ henceforth a more summary form; a few years later on this rule became the succinct code of criminal and disciplinary procedure in the United States. Never, indeed, in this Church which had grown so extensive and so important, had the effort to enforce the canonical law been entirely successful. Judgments were rendered "*ex æquo et bono*," which, according to many, meant neither in equity nor in justice, and the experimental rule of 1878 was productive of the most questionable results. But now we are in possession of a clearly defined code, to which (with the exception of a few exempted dioceses and vicariates still subject to the regulations of 1878), we must conform in treating all criminal and disciplinary cases of clerics "*summarie et sine strepitu*." A point, also to be remarked, is that the present instruction "*cum magnopere*" does not, like its prototype of 1880, give the bishops a merely facultative and commodious way of rendering justice, but it appears to constitute for the United States the ordinary method of procedure, to be followed "*subpœna nullitatis actorum*," and also to replace for us in this country the more solemn procedure which the entire Church used heretofore. Such is the opinion of Mgr. Messmer our distinguished predecessor in the Chair of Canon Law in the Catholic University of America, as expressed in his able adaptation of Dr. Droste's work on canonical procedure. Such also is our opinion.

Again, if we examine the matter closely, we shall see this is a natural deduction from Article 311 of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. "*Processum judiciale Episcopus instruere debet vel ob . . . vel . . . eumque summarie et sine strepitu conficiat.*"

The expressions "forma œconomica, summaria," should not deceive any one; they are used merely to bring out in greater relief the difference established between the present procedure and the various usages of other times; moreover it is perfectly correct at present to designate the rules of the Constitution *Cum Magnopere* in the canonical terminology of "forma canonica—forma ordinaria," etc.

We can hardly appreciate the prudence which guided the framing of this important document. Following the wise principle that even a trifling negligence in the rules of procedure may hinder the demonstration of truth and so hamper and fetter the administration of justice, the legislator wished at one and the same time, to protect the sacred rights of the accused, without curtailing in the least the rightful authority of the bishop. Hence those fatherly and patient measures enumerated in the first part of the instruction, those frequent warnings and monitions, slight punishments more medicinal than penal in their character, in a word the whole system which charitably lingers in repeated efforts to effect a cure before drawing up any formal indictment. Of course all these premonitory measures cannot be employed in every case; there are some laws which of their very nature are so general and so essential that their very existence is a continual note of warning; there are some crimes so crying that justice can brook no delay, but is bound to act at once; still the same spirit of leniency and toleration is always manifest and even when prompt severity is an imperative obligation, and when to punish becomes a necessary duty; the charity, patience, and especially scrupulous justice which ever accompany the Church's action rob it of all semblance of harshness and win for it the respect of all.

* * * * *

There is one point on which the document of 1884 insists with marked emphasis as meriting particular attention, and that is on the mode of originating the process itself. The reasons for this are clear to every one. Under the old procedure the preliminary debates afforded numerous ways of reaching the truth, the frequent and reiterated examination of witnesses, an almost unrestrained liberty given to ecclesiastical judges as to the way of exercising their authority, the support in case of need of the civil power, and most of all throughout all classes of society a true sense of the Church's mission—all this singularly favored the administration of justice. We do not pretend that everything was perfect—far from it—it would be very easy to find subject for stinging criticism in the tiresome delays, the ridiculous quibblings, and the barbarous methods of investigation which too often disgraced and dishonored certain tribunals of the past, but all this

does not concern us for the present. We merely wish to note that the preliminary investigation had not then the same importance which it has assumed in our day, because the trial afforded the fitting time and place for eliciting all the information required. However without serious and well-grounded reasons no criminal inquiry could be started, and outside the cases of formal complaint and official denunciation, the law never permitted a judge to institute criminal proceedings without having very reliable information inculcating the accused.

Here a question of no small importance arises. Common law and the majority of its best and most reliable interpreters look upon "*prævia infamatio*" or alleged culpability as so indispensably necessary that its sole absence makes a canonical inquiry instituted against an accused person, who is really but not ostensibly guilty, subject to rescission as irregular. Dr. Smith, so well known by his able adaptations of canon law to the wants of our clergy, and whose recent death leaves such a gap in the alas! too scattered ranks of American canonists, defends this view very energetically in many of his writings. Dr. Pierantonelli, whose competence in judicial matters is universally recognized, holds the contrary opinion. What are we to follow? The matter is of extreme importance, since nowadays, a great number of (not to say all) ecclesiastical cases are the outcome of a special inquiry undertaken at the instigation of the diocesan promotor. The bishop is bound by his pastoral office to employ every means in his power to root out abuses and to watch over the morals of his clergy, and he relies in a great measure on the promotor for a useful and intelligent discharge of this duty. Upon receiving trustworthy information of a crime, the promotor becomes in law the public prosecutor and is entrusted with the maintenance of justice and the law, and empowered to introduce a criminal or correctional charge which ought to originate *ex officio* "*nuncio quocumque modo ad curiam perlato.*"

Supposing the promotor hears that one or two reliable and prudent persons are aware of the hitherto hidden excesses of an ecclesiastic of apparent good standing, or even of less odious faults, but constituting grave violations of the canons, *v.g.*, drunkenness, publishing newspaper attacks against diocesan authority, etc., what is to be done?

The promotor's first duty is to inform the bishop of the abuse he has discovered. The "Instructio" of 1884 authorizes the immediate beginning of a trial on information received "*quocumque modo.*" The canonical investigations then begin; but what about the *prævia diffamatio*?

Suppose the trial conducted in the usual way and the priest

convicted on the evidence brought forward and sentenced accordingly, is the sentence good and valid in law?

According to the majority of ancient authorities such a sentence is null and void, or at least subject to appeal and liable to be set aside. According to Dr. Pierantonelli and Mgr. Messmer (although the latter's opinion is not as clearly stated), the sentence holds good. We have no intention of taking upon ourselves the solution of the difficulty, although we admit a preference for the second opinion. Without then hazarding anything pretending to be a final settlement of a disputed and still open question of law, we proceed to give the reasons which underlie our view of the matter.

* * * * *

A criminal or disciplinary inquiry before the ecclesiastical courts has two very distinct phases—one private, the other public. The instructio, "*Cum Magnopere*," has exercised no marked influence over the latter; but it has given the former a very distinctive character, and upon this standpoint it has been carefully drawn up and minutely described.

To get a right understanding of the procedure in our modern judicial investigations it is necessary to recall to mind the three classical modes of originating a criminal process. This consideration is requisite when we remember that the promotor, whose presence is indispensable in our modern process, becomes the official public prosecutor, and that his information originally came from allegations lodged and inquiries instituted.

In the early stage of canon law, criminal proceedings usually originated from an *accusation* and complaint. In judicial language by accusation is meant an information preferred against a person charged with the commission of a criminal act, in view of legal investigation and with the obligation of furnishing judicial proof of the charge advanced. This duty is often so disagreeable and the consequences so onerous in the ordinary course of human relations that, taken in connection with a less ardent faith, there are very few so devoted to the supreme good of religion as to expose themselves to so many inconveniences for its sake! Had other methods of obtaining the same results not been adopted, justice would have become powerless, to the great detriment of order and public discipline in the Church. Hence the law admitted and took cognizance of a complaint without exacting any demonstration of the charge. This way often proving inefficacious, the example of the Roman civil law suggested to the Church the appointment of fiscal procurators with the double charge of looking after the interests of the diocese and of instituting legal proceedings against all violators of the ecclesiastical

laws. They take the place of the accuser of former times or lodge official information of any denunciation they receive. They belong, nevertheless, to the class of accusers. The *lex talionis*, or law of retaliation, has been abolished, and very wisely. The authority with which the promotor is invested, his exalted station, the moral dignity of his character, his legal knowledge attested by his selection, in addition to his various and weighty responsibilities, are so many reasons to free him from the disagreeable consequences of a duty which under other circumstances no devotedness would assume. With that one difference the promotor holds the place of the old accuser. His charges against the accused are in due time put in the form of an indictment and clothed in all the formalities established by legal custom. However, we must remark that the fact of the promotor getting an official position in the Curia did not abolish the old-time method of criminal procedure by accusation. It is true that this mode of originating a trial becomes less frequent every day; but still it retains its place on the statute books, and before disuse makes its practice illegal, all who wish to lodge complaints as accusers before the ecclesiastical courts are to be admitted. The fact is that no one may be lawfully excluded, and the XI. Art. of the Instruction, "*Cum Magnopere*," gives the reason when it mentions this method among the recognized forms of opening a trial: "Processus instruitur vel . . . vel accusatione, vel . . . etc." It is, however, to be remarked that even in case of an inquiry originating by accusation, the rules given in the Instruction must not be lost sight of. The duty of the examining judge, though lightened by the co-operation of the accuser, still retains its *raison d'être*, for the accused can only be summoned to answer the charges preferred against him when his guilt has been sufficiently established either by oral or by documentary evidence.

This procedure is, however, the exception rather than the rule; ordinarily, a crime is made known by *denunciation*. Denunciation is information conveyed to an ecclesiastical judge by a person who is trustworthy and reliable, but who is unwilling to assume the obligation of proving the charge. Here we have the point from which proceeds the special legislation governing the preliminary inquiry. The crime is known to the one who should suppress or punish it, but the proof is not given by the one who advances the complaint. Hence, a duty of extreme gravity falls on the judge, viz., the verification of the charge which alone entitles him to act. The importance of the judicial inquiry springs naturally from the very nature of the denunciation.

In spite of the prejudice which at first sight is aroused by the mere idea of informing on or denouncing another, the thoughtful

observer will not take long to discover the true nature, the necessity, even the exalted aim and noble object of this course. It is St. Thomas himself who says:¹ "Quædam peccata occulta sunt, quæ in nocumentum proximorum vel corporale vel spirituale. . . . Et quia qui sic occulte peccat, non solum in se peccat, sed etiam in alios, oportet statim procedere ad denuntiationem ut huiusmodi nocumentum impediatur." Impossible to put the matter more clearly or more tersely. Authors draw a sharp distinction between evangelical and judicial denunciation. For us there is no necessity now to dwell on this distinction, but once more let us repeat how denunciation differs from accusation in not requiring judicial proof of what it advances. The effect of a serious denunciation answering all the required conditions is to originate a special inquiry. The judge, as Reiffenstuel remarks, not only *may* but *ought* to institute official proceedings, summon witnesses, collect evidence, etc.

This rapid sketch of the two primitive modes of beginning criminal inquiries formerly most in use, leads us to the consideration of the "inquisitio judicialis," which has grown very important, but owing to recent legislation, greatly changed in character.

Every bishop is under a strict obligation to enforce ecclesiastical discipline in his diocese, and there should be nothing to hamper him in the discharge of this important duty. "Habeant igitur," says Pope John,² "episcopi singularium urbium in suis diocesibus liberam potestatem adulteria et scelera *inquirere*, ulcisci, et iudicare, secundum quod Canones censent, et absque impedimento alicujus." And the instruction "*Cum Magnopere*" inspired³ with the same sentiments addresses the bishops in not less forcible terms in reference to the clergy in particular: "Ordinarius pro suo pastorali munere, tenetur disciplinam correptionemque clericorum ita diligenter curare, ut circa eorum mores assidue vigilet, ac remedia à Canonibus statuta, sive præcavendis, sive tollendis abusibus in clerum aliquando irrepentibus, providè adhibeat."

The bishop must however avoid being too severe a censor; he must know when it is better for him to close his eyes on abuses which he is powerless to correct. It is the prudent Gonzalez Tellez who says somewhere,⁴ that in certain cases it is often better to leave some of the claims of justice unanswered than to give rise to a whole series of abuses by an unwise severity which a little timely indulgence would have prevented. St. Thomas also warns⁵ against such judgments and punishments as are productive of no good re-

¹ 2. 2æ, Q., xxiii., a. 7.

² Cap. I., Perniciosa, tit. xxxi. *De offic. judicis ordinarii*, lib. i. Decret.

³ Art. I.

⁴ *Comment.* Cap. 3, tit. ii., lib. ii. Decret.

⁵ 2. 2æ, Q., xliii., a. 7.

sult, "quando ex illis non medicina sed ruina potest evenire." It is needless to say how willingly we endorse such prudent counsels. Every one placed at the head of an important administration, especially entrusted with the government of men, should remember that moderation and charity are safer and better guides to follow than any exacting severity; nevertheless, a system of toleration bordering on weakness would be still more blamable in itself and more fatal in its consequences. An overstrained condescension, and forbearance, pushed beyond certain limits, are most lamentable shortcomings in a bishop and an unfailing source of ruin and disorder in a diocese. St. Gregory gives expression to this thought in his usual forceful and expressive language: "Compassionem¹ vero animi plerumque obsidet pietas falsa, ut hanc non nunquam usque ad condescendendum vitiis pertrahat, cum ad culpas quisque non debeat compassionem exercere sed zelum. Compassio quippe homini, et rectitudo vitiis debetur, ut in uno eodemque homine, et diligamus bonum quod factum est et persequamur mala quæ fecit, ne dum culpas incaute rimittimus, non jam per caritatem compati sed per negligentiam concidisse videamur." Such are the leading ideas which control the proceedings at the episcopal investigation. We have now to see these principles at work, for it is necessary to be fully acquainted with the details before entering upon a close study of our modern judicial inquiry.

Canonists carefully distinguish several forms of *Inquisitio*. First of all, there is the *inquisitio omnino generalis*, which the bishop makes in his ordinary pastoral visits, when he inquires into the observance of the laws and the various infractions committed against them. Again, there is an *inquisitio personalis*, or kind of investigation about persons, where there is no supposition of crime entertained. Such are the various investigations or inquiries instituted concerning persons about to be married, in order to discover any existing canonical impediments. Inquiries of a like nature are made in view of ecclesiastical preferments, the authorities having to see to "quis sit dignior." It need hardly be said that we have nothing to say here to these two kinds of inquiries. It may happen, however, that a bishop is aware of the existence of a crime without knowing the culprit; then he sets to work to make sure of the fact and all the circumstances connected with it. This is an *inquisitio*, or inquiry, which canonists call *general*. It becomes *special* when the inquiry extends to the person of the criminal as well as to the fact of the crime.

Before the recent instructions of the Roman Congregations, and in spite of all the practical difficulties which were in the way, the

¹ Homil., xxxii, in *Evang. Migne*. P. L., t. lxxvi., p. 1255.

judicial procedure was governed by the following rules: When a bishop became aware of a crime, or a grave violation of canonical discipline, either by formal complaint or even by public rumor, it was his duty to proceed to the *inquisitio generalis*. He was not bound to defer action until public opinion had incriminated any one; he could even give his investigation the recognized special character, provided inquiries were limited to the crime and not directed against any particular person. In other words, at this stage of the proceedings the questions put to witnesses should be in the form of "Do you know the author of this crime?" rather than "Is Mr. A. or B. the culprit?" If, from the depositions of witnesses or from the examination of the papers and documents in the case, the delinquent be not clearly designated, the inquiry should be brought to a close, lest the reputation of some one in good standing before the public become endangered from individual suspicions and misgivings. Perhaps the suspect was really the guilty party, but as long as his good name was recognized, the Canons gave him every advantage he was entitled to and forbade the judge to call it in question or to violate it.

Trifles, minutiae, we may hear some say. Far from it; for here is at stake the honor, the peace of mind, the very life of the accused, and no laws can be too particular in surrounding with every conceivable safeguard a good so far transcending all others. If it be a duty to repress wrong-doing, there is a still more sacred duty to protect private rights, and especially the noblest and best of all—an unspotted reputation. It is, then, with feelings akin to veneration that we read the long and sometimes complicated treatises of the old canonists who defended with such praiseworthy zeal every man's inalienable right to shield his name and character against the dangers of imprudently conducted investigations. No principle, however, must be considered merely in the cut-and-dried terms in which it is formulated. It must be a working principle, and so tested by the circumstances in which it will have to operate, and account taken of the many exceptions which will be found needed to modify its action. Here we have a striking example of this, which the reader will easily perceive if he follows us a little longer in an exposition somewhat arid and technical perhaps, but still of the utmost practical importance.

* * * * *

The law which we gave above is clear. No judge is allowed to take proceedings *ex mero officio* against any alleged criminal unless the accused be already *diffamatus*. Innocent III. says so positively: "Respondemus nullum esse pro crimine super quo aliquâ non laborat infamiâ seu clamarosa insinuatio non praeceperit . . . puniendum. Quinimo super hac depositiones contra

eum recipi non debere, *quum inquisitio fieri debeat solummodo super illis de quibus clamores aliqui praecesserint.*" The glossa confirms the judicial bearing of this declaration, "Ex hoc habes quod de occultis non est inquirendum." The same doctrine and the same interpretations are met in many places in the "Corpus Juris." The Council of Lateran, in 1216, decrees,¹ "Sicut accusationem legitima debet praecedere inscriptio, sicut denuntiationem charitativa monitio, et inquisitionem clamorosa insinuatio praevinire." According to the glossa, a praevia infamatio is essential for the opening of a criminal case. Innocent III. is most positive in maintaining this principle. In the chapter "Cum oporteat"² we may read his very precise instructions given to the judges commissioned by him to investigate charges made against an unworthy bishop, where he dwelt with more than special emphasis on the reserve which should mark the opening of the trial. This idea had so entered into the spirit of the times that it was not uncommon to find criminals admitting their guilt and its malice, and still claiming the immunity accorded by Boniface VIII.,³ without assigning any other reason than that proceedings were taken against them in the absence of any alleged culpability.⁴ It is useless to multiply examples.

This infamatio, according to the commentators, should proceed from the reflections of upright and trustworthy persons, and not from the mere gossip of backbiters, which merits nothing but contempt, and several intimations of the same criminal fact should be made.⁵ Schmalzgrubber, with that usual good sense which never fails him, gives us the reason of this regulation.⁶ If, he tells us, every evil rumor afforded sufficient grounds for proceeding to an investigation, no one, even the very best, would be long safe, for evil tongues attack all, and everybody knows how rapidly and how widely evil reports circulate.

The wisdom of this course, even under its purely juridical features, commends itself to every thoughtful mind. Hear the proof Lessius advances: "Judex," he says, "quando ad punitiōnem criminum procedit debet ex scientiā publicā procedere: scientia autem publica est quæ habetur per accusationem vel con-

¹ Cap. 24, "Qualiter," tit. i., *De Accusationibus*, lib. v., Decret.

² 19, tit. i., libr. Decret.

³ Cap. "Postquam," 1 tit. i., lib. v. in 6°.

⁴ Cap. "Si is," 2, tit. i., lib. v. in 6°.

⁵ Cf. cap. "Qualiter," 24 tit., lib. v., *Decretalium*: "si per clamorem et famam ad aures superioris pervenerit non quidem a malevolis et maledicis, sed a providis et honestis, non semel tantum, sed sc̄pe quod clamor innuit et diffamatio manifestat."

⁶ *Op. cit.*, t. x., v. 199.

fessionem rei in iudicio, vel per infamiam aut per facti evidentiam in conspectu iudicis vel aliorum."¹

Ecclesiastical authorities have, we must say, no reason for neglecting this rule. Their own peace of mind, the natural desire of keeping clear of all untimely complications, the dread of drawing upon themselves well-deserved opprobrium, are motives usually sufficient to enforce the observance of the law and to prevent undue hurry. However, we must take into consideration the weakness of our human nature and admit that circumstances might easily arise in which a superior would be impelled by feelings of personal animosity to inquire into the hidden transgressions of an inferior. These precautions, officially adopted by the Church, are far from being uncalled for; they are often much needed checks on misplaced zeal. Another danger to be equally avoided is in being too great a stickler for the mere letter of the law, and in retrenching oneself behind too absolute a formalism. Good common sense in default of law texts, the well-founded experience of practitioners, the precedents and rulings of the tribunals, all conspire in forming a kind of unwritten code of exceptions, the justice of which no one ever dreams of disputing or questioning. Thus, it is certain that there is no need of a *prævia diffamatio* to sanction the opening of a trial against a public delinquent. Publicity may be had in more ways than one. To say nothing of the crimes occurring during the very hearing of a case, such as the open perjury of a witness, etc., self-incrimination, even indirectly intimated, answers the purpose of publicity. Again, the accused may waive his right to profit by this *prævia infamatio*, and allow the process to be started. Authors go even still further, and admit that any incriminatory information, even made with wicked purpose, received by the bishop in the course of a general inquiry, suffices to warrant the introduction of a suit before the episcopal court.

Another class of exceptions is often called into being by the very nature of things; thus indications, unmistakably clear, may produce such a semblance of guilt as to forbid any delay in calling for a trial. Again, crimes are so often correlated or linked and chained together that the presence of one creates almost moral certainty of the reality of another. Thus, for example, we would lose our time in trying to convince any one that a *prævia diffamatio* of murder was necessary against one juridically convicted of criminal intercourse with the murdered man's faithless wife. The finger of suspicion points unmistakably to the guilty party.

¹ *De jure et justitia*, lib. ii., cap. xxix., No. 122.

Lastly, there is another category of wrongs which is excepted from the rule given above. Some crimes are most pregnant of evil and very disastrous in their consequences. Some, such as heresy and apostacy, may rob the soul of faith; others may work irreparable harm to a third party or endanger the whole community; some such as give rise to diriment impediments may render a sacrament null and void; others may procure the ecclesiastical preferment of some unworthy subject, etc. It would be puerile, in offences such as these, to dally over formalities, however estimable in themselves, when every haste and effort should be made to secure the general good. Here, again, action may precede any *prævia infamatio*. These exceptions evidently limit the extension and application of the principle.

* * * * *

But the matter before us is of quite a different nature. At present there can be no longer question of those investigations made by the bishops in their rare and stately pastoral visits of long ago, when communications were slow and difficult, and seldom undertaken, and when the want of publicity made the knowledge of crime a matter of no easy attainment. To-day distances are, as it were, abolished; the daily press, the telegraph, the continual ebb and flow of travel, a detective and police service thoroughly equipped and perfectly organized, render the concealment of crime a matter of extreme difficulty, and of comparatively rare occurrence. Again, bishops now-a-days have rarely to interfere in a judicial capacity in the affairs of laymen, their action being mostly confined to clerical cases. All this leads us to the inference that we are in presence of changed and particular conditions, and that the knowledge of a crime unaccompanied by defamation is now practically impossible and scarcely conceivable. But even admitting the possibility of the thing, there is no use in getting involved in a maze of useless and obsolete formalities, whose very reason for existence is greatly changed. For, in a word, what does our modern inquisitio come to? Simply, to a searching and secret examination into the truth or falsehood of an allegation made against an ecclesiastic. And, it is to be noted, that no matter how such prejudicial information be lodged, the bishop is bound to make an investigation, and to establish the facts. Such is the traditional practice sanctioned by custom, and confirmed by experience. Such now is the formal law embodied in the instruction "*Cum Magnopere*." The judge must collect evidence of every crime of which he is made cognizant. Taking into consideration the changed conditions of society, and admitting to the full the great wisdom of the ancient discipline, and the continuance of the spirit which actuated it, etc., we have no hesitation in seeing in the recent

instruction a modification of the texts given above from Innocent III., and similar sources. It need scarcely be said that even when the crime is sufficiently established, no bishop is going to hurry the opening of a trial. Far from it. The instruction which is now his guide directs otherwise, and following it, the bishop will have recourse to entreaty, to friendly warnings, to commands, or to punishments, intended to change the heart of the culprit who may be often led astray, and a victim of weakness rather than a confirmed and hardened criminal, so that the cases will be rare when severe measures will have to be employed in consequence of a formal judgment. We may then conclude that the circumstances entitling the accused to take advantage of a non-diffamatio before the opening of a trial are necessarily very few.

To avoid all equivocation, we would like to see a clearer distinction established between the ancient "*inquisitio specialis*" and our modern judicial inquiry. We think that it is wrong to confound the two, although we admit a great analogy and similarity between them, especially in the method of proceeding. The preliminary proceedings which authors commonly call "*compilatio processus*," or *processus informativus*, or again *processus pro informatione curie*, are really distinct from the ancient *inquisitio specialis*. The object of the former is to ascertain the solidity of the reasons authorizing a criminal inquiry—this "*instructio processus*" is not the process itself. It took a long time to give definite expression to a distinction so easy, but it is in legal matters especially that men cling to forms even when the institutions underlying them are modified; so here the simplest thing to do is to admit a corresponding modification of procedure.

It is hardly possible for an attentive observer not to remark the frequent breaches made in judicial theories. Reiffenstuel in his time, by a logical deduction drawn from the nature of the promotor's functions, made the following statement: "*Potest iudex nullâ præcedente infamiâ instituere inquisitionem specialem ad præviam denunciationem ministri seu officialis publici ad indaganda et demonstranda crimina ex officio delegati.*" His views were, indeed, open to criticism, and objections apparently well grounded in his time were urged against him, but now, in the actual state of our laws, it seems hard not to adopt his opinions in consequence of the entirely changed procedure adopted by our judges. Dr. Pierantonelli brings out this point admirably when he says: "*diebus nostris inquisitio est actus extrajudicialis, nec pertinet ad processum judicalem, sed tantum inservire eidem potest . . . juxta disciplinam antiquam, inquisitio erat remedium extraordinarium, modo, ordinarium est.*" This change affecting the nature of the *inquisitio* by extending it to all indictable cases, explains very

clearly the diminished importance of the *prævia diffamatio*. When we consider that all modern investigations are made in private, and all possible precautions are taken to guard against useless scandal, it will easily appear that the honor of an innocent man is not endangered, and hence that the most cogent arguments in favor of *diffamatio* are no longer available. The opening of an inquiry does not then demand at present reasons of such weighty moment as were formerly considered necessary, and in certain cases, vague, undefined suspicions are deemed sufficient.

We are forced to admit that these conclusions though appearing to us very reasonable and well grounded, are still open to discussion. And first of all, the recent documents nowhere directly declare that the old legislation of the decretals has become obsolete and consequently the commentaries of the ancient doctors unfounded and worthless. These reasons, and others which might be added, are not without their weight, but viewed in the light of a close study of the document of 1884 and the practical conclusions which follow from it, they do not seem of sufficient importance to counterbalance the necessity which is practically incumbent of following a totally different course. Is it, we ask, possible, that there is a promotor with well defined powers and official duties, but who is unable to act until public opinion and public talk have published to the world a scandal which it was his duty and within his power to prevent? This would be opposed to common sense and contrary to the natural conclusions drawn from the instruction we are studying. It is left to the bishop to determine when he should apply the remedies which the law puts at his disposal for the protection of ecclesiastical discipline and the safe guarding of Christian morality. There is no danger that the bishop may abuse his authority. Ordinary prudence, indeed, will dissuade him from having recourse to public measures when he may employ the equally efficacious extra-judicial remedy *ex informata conscientia*, and moreover, the occasion will very rarely occur when it will be necessary to open an inquiry where a *prævia diffamatio* does not already exist against the accused. Admitting however, such a possibility, we think that it would be extremely difficult for the defendant to have an unfavorable judgment reversed on the plea that a secret inquiry was made against him, although no previous diffamation existed. The text appears formal. "Processus ex officio instituitur. . . . nuncio quocumque modo ad curiam perlato." Moreover the investigation commenced by the bishop through the ordinary legal channels is different from the old *inquisitio specialis* and does not appear subject to the same regulations. And lastly, according to some writers even an injurious accusation and designation of "reus" justify

the opening of a special inquiry. We do not see how this conclusion can be avoided.

* * * * *

With this established, we shall now give but a brief summary of the elements making up the judicial instruction. Its object is to establish the innocence or guilt of the accused. It is made up of two parts. The first or preliminary stage is carried out as much as possible without the knowledge of the accused. The actual verification of the crime should be corroborated by the formal depositions of witnesses, the instruments, if any, employed in the commission of the deed should be produced, all written documents pertinent to the case should be put in evidence, etc. Then the examining judge should bring together, study and compare the various charges and proofs before him, and if the complaint appear sufficiently sustained, he is empowered to summon the accused to explain or refute the allegations against him.

The great importance of this secret phase of the inquiry forbids us from attempting to deal with it here, especially as our article is exclusively intended to throw into relief *one* of the chief features of our modern judicial investigation.

G. PÉRIES, D.D.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON.

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED SYRIAC GOSPELS.

THE briefest history of the discovery and transcription of the newly found Syriac Gospels is given on the title-page of their printed edition: "The four Gospels in Syriac transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest by the late Robert L. Bensly, Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, and by J. Rendel Harris, Lecturer in Palæography in the University of Cambridge, and by F. Crawford Burkitt, M.A., with an Introduction by Agnes Smith Lewis; edited for the Syndics of the University Press; Cambridge, at the University Press, 1894." The introduction supplies the needed supplementary information. In the month of February, 1892, the Librarian Galaktion of the Convent of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai, showed Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis among other Syriac MSS. one that attracted her attention by its look of venerable antiquity and by the fact that its leaves were glued together by age. The MS. proved to be a palimpsest, the upper writing of which contained mainly a martyrology, while the under or earlier one was identified with portions of the Synoptic Gospels. Mrs. Lewis, assisted by her sister, Mrs. Jane Young Gibson, photographed the whole MS., and in the month of July, 1892, Professor Bensly and Mr. F. C. Burkitt, succeeded in deciphering enough of the gospel-text to pronounce it nearly allied to the so-called Curetonian.¹ The two scholars continued to work at the photographs, but though they deciphered some thirty pages during the course of the autumn, they soon perceived that a direct inspection of the MS. was necessary. They were joined by Mr. J. Rendel Harris, who had discovered the Apology of Aristides in the same monastery during the year 1889. Galaktion who had in the meantime become Hegoumenos or abbot of the convent, received the party most hospitably, and delivered the Syriac MS. for the space of forty days (February 8 to March 20, 1893), into the hands of Mrs. Lewis, and it was during this period that her

¹ In the year 1842 Dr. Tattam brought to England from a Nitrian monastery a number of manuscripts, among which was one of the four Gospels. The manuscript proved to be heterogeneous, being composed of eighty-two and a half leaves of ancient writing, supplemented by others of more recent date, so as to form a complete volume of the Gospels. Dr. Cureton, then one of the officials of the British Museum, recognizing the superior age of the eighty-two and a half leaves, separated them from the rest, and after a careful examination was led to the conclusion that he had found fragments of a translation of the Gospels older than that contained in the Peshitto. —Cf. Gregory, *Prolegomena*, pp. 825 f.; *The Thinker*, January, 1895, p. 13.

three companions transcribed the Gospels. In the printed text, the name of each transcriber is signified by his initials at the foot of the pages for which he is responsible. Where the initials of two names appear, the page has been revised by two transcribers, and where the names stand within brackets, the text has been read from the photographs of Mrs. Lewis. The printed text reproduces that of the MS. line for line.

The palimpsest contained 182 leaves, $8\frac{5}{8}$ inches by $6\frac{1}{4}$; 142 of these leaves belonged to the original gospel MS., 4 contained originally a Greek text of the fourth gospel, 24 showed in their under writing, parts of Syriac apocrypha, and the remaining 12 were originally a Greek MS. the contents of which have not yet been deciphered. The upper writing on all these leaves consists of one column of 26 lines to the page. It begins on the *verso* of the second leaf, or on the fourth page, with this preface to the martyrology: "By the strength of our Lord Jesus Christ [the son] of the living God, I begin, I the sinner, John the Recluse, of Beth-Mari Kaddish, to write select narratives about the holy women, first, the writings about the blessed Lady Thecla, disciple of Paul, the blessed apostle. Brethren, pray for me." After the life of Thecla follow sketches of Eugenia, Pelagia, Marinus, Euphrosyne, Onesima, Drusis, Barbara, Mary, Irene, Euphemia, Sophia, Theodosia, Theodota; then comes a profession of faith, then the story of Susanna, the life of Cyprian and Justa, and finally "the mansions in Paradise" from the writings of St. Ephrem. At the top of the *verso* of leaf 181 is the date of the upper writing; only a few words are at present legible: "The book was finished in the year a thousand and nine . . . of Alexander the Macedonian son [of Philip] . . . [in the month] Tammuz; on the third day . . . of the day . . . may they be . . . who wrote the book . . . yea and amen."¹ The era of Alexander begins 312 B.C., so that the foregoing date points to 687 A.D. But since the number in the MS. is followed by a hole, we must suppose that either mā [100] or ʾin [the termination of the multiples of ten] has been omitted; hence the year becomes either 1900 or 1090. The former would correspond to A.D. 1588, a date that is wholly improbable; the latter coincides with A.D. 778, a year in keeping with the age of the original writing of the last twelve leaves in the palimpsest, which belongs to the eighth century. John the Recluse must therefore have used the recently inscribed leaves of the Greek MS. to complete his martyrology.

¹ Cf. Preface, xv.: Mrs. Lewis informs us that this part had evidently suffered somewhat in the period between her two visits; the month of Tammuz is the Aramean month which nearly corresponds to our July.

The clause "of Beth-Mari Kaddish" which follows "John the Recluse" might lead one to suspect that the second or upper writing had its origin in the place of the foregoing name in Lebanon. But strong reasons militate against this assumption. First, in the profession of faith contained in the upper writing, Nestorius, Eutyches and Dioscorus are anathematized, so that the writing cannot have been done in Mesopotamia, Egypt, or the Jacobite regions of Syria. This leaves us upper Syria, Palestine and Sinai as possible homes of the palimpsest. Secondly, Mr. Harris gives good reasons for supposing that portions of the Syriac apocrypha which constitute the under, or earlier, writing of part of the palimpsest, are still extant in the Sinai library. Unless we assume, therefore, that the second writer did his work on Sinai, it is extremely difficult to account for the manner in which the stray leaves of the destroyed MS. of Syriac apocrypha found their way to the very same library in which their sister-leaves, written over by John the Recluse, had been deposited.¹ Beth-Mari Kaddish may have been the native place of John, or of his parents, so that this addition to his name cannot astonish us, even if he did not write in his native place.

Thus far we have examined the upper writing of the palimpsest, not thoroughly, but sufficiently for our purpose. We come now to the principal object of our study, or that portion of the under, or earlier, writing which contains the gospel-text. It has already been stated that only 142 leaves of the palimpsest belong to the original gospel-volume. It can be ascertained that the latter consisted in its primitive form of 17 quires; 14 of these were quinions, *i.e.*, consisted of 10 leaves each, but the sixth, fifteenth and sixteenth contained only eight leaves each. The whole volume contained therefore 164 leaves; since 142 are preserved in the palimpsest, only 22 have been lost. But five of these, the first two and the last three, contained no portions of the gospels, so that only 17 gospel-leaves are lost. It must, however, be added that portions of the preserved leaves are illegible, and remained so, even on application of hydrosulphide of ammonia which the monks allowed the transcribers to make use of. The original writing is in two columns, with an uncertain number of lines in each. There are no lines ruled for the text, though vertical ones existed on the side of each page. The second writer did not follow the order of pages of the gospel-manuscript, but tore out the leaves at random, and supplied a new order of pages. The final colophon reads: "Here ends the gospel of the Měpharrěshē, four books (or writers): glory to God and to his Christ and to his Holy Spirit.

¹ Cf. Preface, xvi., xvii.

Let every one that reads and hears and observes and does, pray for the sinner that wrote it, that God may have mercy on him, and remit him his sins in both worlds. Amen and amen."¹ This is followed on the same page by a column of writing not yet deciphered. It contains, no doubt, important items concerning the history of the MS.—perhaps its date. As it is, Mr. Harris, in the November number of the *Contemporary Review*, supposes that the gospel was written in the fifth century, and is a tolerably accurate copy of a translation dating back to the second century.

The peculiarities of the Syriac gospels may be reduced to three points: First, they omit those parts that are omitted in other very ancient manuscripts; such are the story of the adulterous woman, John vii., 53–viii., 11; the end of the second gospel, Mk., xvi., 9 ff.; the mention of the bloody sweat, Lk., xxii., 43, 44; the prayer of Jesus for his executioners, Lk., xxiii., 34; the statement that the inscription on the cross was in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, Lk., xxiii., 38b; the words "and was carried up to heaven," Lk., xxiv., 51b. Besides, there are a few omissions that are peculiar to the Syriac MS.: The mocking of Jesus before Herod, together with the immediate context, Lk., xxiii., 10–12; the fact that Jesus showed his disciples his hands and feet after the resurrection, Lk., xxiv., 40. Secondly, the Syriac MS. is free from acknowledged interpolations such as characterize other MSS., *e.g.*, the cod. D.; it is, therefore, rather remarkable for its agreement with the best codd. Thirdly, in spite of this general agreement with other codd., the Sinaitic MS. presents readings numerous and peculiar enough to give it a special character. We shall state them in order, leaving, however, those of the first chapter of Matthew for the next paragraph.²

Mt. iii., 11, reads, "he shall baptize you in fire and in the Holy Ghost," instead of "he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and fire." Mt. xiii., 48, the fish taken out of the net to be preserved are described as *very* good. Mt. xviii., 20, the Lord's promise of his presence is expressed in the negative form: "There are not two or three gathered together in my name, and I not amongst them." The cod. Bezae has the same reading. Mt. xviii., 22, the duty of unlimited forgiveness is expressed thus: "Not until seven, but until seventy times seven seven," a reading supported by both Peshitto and Curetonian text. Mt. xxi., 31, 32 presents more remarkable variations. To the question of our Lord, "which of the two did the father's will?" the chief priests and ancients answer, "the last," as we read in B. and D.,³ instead of "the first."

¹ Cf. Preface, xx.

² Many of these readings have been noted in *The Thinker*, April, 1895, pp. 289 ff.

³ The Vatican cod., and the cod. Bezae.

In Christ's answer, the Sinaitic MS. omits the negative particle, so that we read: "And you seeing it, at last repented that you might believe on him"; the chief priests and the ancients of the people are represented as going into the kingdom of God, but after the publicans and harlots. Mt. xxv., 1, the ten virgins taking their lamps, "went out to meet the bridegroom *and the bride*," just as we read in D., the Diatessaron as edited by Ciasca, the Peshitto, a later Syriac version [White], certain codd. of the Itala, the Latin Vulgate, the Armenian version, etc.¹ But the fact that "and the bride" is omitted in the best codd., and that it does not well agree with vv. 5, 6, 10, shows the spuriousness of the clause. Mt. xxvii., 17, gives the question of Pilate in a most striking manner: "Whom will you that I release to you, *Jesus Barabbas*, or Jesus that is called Christ?"

The following are the principal peculiar readings in the second gospel: Mk. vi., 20, states that Herod Antipas did many things which he heard from the Baptist: "And many things that he heard from him he did, and heard him gladly." This reading is pronounced genuine by Knabenbauer,² on account of its difficulty. Mk. vii., 26, the Syro-Phœnician woman is described as a widow. Mk. ix., 26, the lunatic child healed after our Lord's transfiguration, was not only "lifted up" by Jesus, but also delivered to his father. In a similar way, our Lord gave back the widow's son to his mother after raising him to life (Lk. vii., 15). Mk. ix., 35 f. reads, "and he took a certain child, and set him in the midst of them, and looked at him and said to them," instead of, "and taking a child, he set him in the midst of them; whom when he had embraced, he saith to them." Mk. x., 17, the rich ruler accosts Jesus whilst the latter was on a journey, not "when he was gone forth into the way." Mk. x., 50, the blind Bartimeus, or Bar-Timai, as the Syriac gives the name, "took up his garment" when he rose and went to Jesus, instead of "casting off his garment"; Mrs. Lewis appeals to Eastern habits as favoring the Syriac reading.

The Syriac variations are more numerous in the third gospel. Lk. x., 41 f., where our Lord rebukes Martha for "being troubled about many things," the Sinaitic MS. omits "but one thing is necessary," so that the rebuke is much gentler than in the Received Text. In Lk. x., 35, the good Samaritan leaves the inn "at the dawn of day." Lk. xi., 5, the man who asks for bread at midnight introduces his petition with the words, "my friend." Lk. xv., 13, the prodigal son lives "wastefully with harlots," while according to the Received Text he "wasted his substance, living

¹ Cf. Knabenbauer, *in loc.*

² *In loc.*

riotously." Lk. xv., 30, the elder brother, speaking to the father after the return of the prodigal, rebukes him for killing "*that* fattened calf." Lk. xvi., 20, the Lazarus of the parable is described as a poor man. Lk. xvi., 22, the rich man is "cast into hell," instead of being buried in hell. Lk. xviii., 5, the unjust judge is afraid of the widow, lest she should "come and *take hold of him*." Lk. xx., 58, Peter accompanies one of his denials with the words, "let me alone." Lk. xxiii., 9, omits the account of the mockery by Herod, as we have seen already. The hearing is described thus: "Then he questioned him in *cunning* words, but Jesus returned him no answer." Lk. xxiii., 37, the crown of thorns is worn on the cross, a point that is left doubtful in the Received Text.

The peculiar readings of the fourth gospel are more numerous than those in any of the first three. John iii., 5, reverses the order of water and the Spirit in our spiritual birth, to "the Spirit and water"; but in verse 8, the words "of water" are prefixed to the clause "of the Spirit," just as we read in the Curetonian, while the Received Text omits "of water" in verse 8. John iv., 36, reads, "and the reaper *straightway* receiveth wages," so that the spiritual sowing is declared to be immediately followed by the reaping. John v., 21, substitutes "even so the Son raiseth up those who believe in Him," for "the Son also giveth life to whom he will." The Curetonian text agrees with the Sinaitic. John xi., 29, Mary the sister of Lazarus "went *eagerly* to Jesus when she had received the message"; in verse 39, Martha asks a question that occurs nowhere else, "why shall they take away the stone?" According to John xii., 3, Mary poured the ointment on our Lord's head before anointing his feet; this may have been introduced from the first and second gospel.¹ In John xiv., 6, we have the emphatic statement, "I, I am the way, and the truth, and the life"; in verse 27 of the same chapter our Lord says, "my *own* peace I give unto you." A few verses before this [xiv., 22], it is not Judas, as in the Received Text, but Thomas who asks the question: "Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to us, and not to the world?" John xviii., 3, attests that the party coming to arrest Jesus included some of the chief priests and Pharisees; the Received Text knows only of servants of the chief priests and Pharisees. According to John xx., 8, Peter and John both believed, when they had seen the empty sepulchre. John xx., 16, tells us that Mary Magdalene *ran towards* the risen Lord, that she might touch him. Finally, in John xxi., 7, Peter swam to the shore after the second miraculous draught of fishes.

¹ Mt., xxvi., 7; Mk., xiv., 3.

Interesting as all the variations of the Sinaitic MS. may be, they do not approach in importance the apparently systematic variations found in the first chapter of St. Matthew.

Verse 16.—Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus.

Verse 21.—She shall bear *thee* a son.

Verse 25.—And she bare *him* a son, and *he* called his name Jesus.

Besides, verse 25 omits "and he knew her not till." Obviously, these readings appear to maintain that our Lord was born according to the ordinary course of nature. If this view could be sustained, the whole question would be an extremely simple one; the text would represent the heretical view of an early Syriac sect, and would have been changed according to the needs of its supporters. But on closer inspection, the whole passage, from verse 16 to 25, insists most emphatically on the virginal conception of our Lord; Mary is found with child of the Holy Ghost [v. 18]; Joseph is troubled, and minded to put Mary away secretly [19]; he is reassured by the angel, and the prophecy of Isaias about the Virgin Mother [20 ff.]; Mary is explicitly called "the Virgin" in the Sinaitic text, though the Received Text speaks of her without that epithet [16]. Hence the problem of the Sinaitic variations has become a rather complicated one, which has found different solutions by different writers.

I. All seem to agree that the Sinaitic text represents a very early Syriac version. E. Nestle¹ words his conclusion thus: "Among all the versions of the New Testament, that contained in the Lewis MS. stands nearest in time and place to the original gospel-text." Mr. Harris² is of opinion that the Syriac translation of the gospels either in its very source or near the same showed the form represented by the Sinaitic text. Mr. R. H. Charles³ believes that the Lewis MS. represents Joseph as the natural father of our Lord, and that this text has served as the basis of the old Latin and the Armenian translation. Mr. F. C. Conybeare⁴ is fully convinced that the Sinaitic text is no corruption of the original text of the gospel. The "*a priori*" reasons peculiar to these writers we shall have occasion to consider later. Their arguments based on objective ground, may be reduced to the following:

a. All the old Syriac texts that have come to light, show either an unorthodox text or at least vestiges of a correction of the same. The first Syriac gospel-text must therefore have been unorthodox.

¹ *Theol. Literatur Zeitg.*, 1894, p. 626 f.

² *Contemporary Review*, Nov., 1894.

³ *Academy*, 1894, ii., p. 447 f.

⁴ *Academy*, Nov. 17, Dec. 22, 1894.

Not to insist on the inconclusiveness of the inference, we may ask Mr. Harris for his proof of the first statement. The Curetonian, we are informed¹ is a correction of an unorthodox text, because in its eagerness to establish the virginity of Mary, it goes to the extreme of changing several ambiguous words that are found even in the orthodox text. In verse 19 it reads; "Joseph" instead of "Joseph her husband"; in verse 20 it has "fear not to take unto thee Mary thy espoused" instead of "Mary thy wife"; in verse 24 it substitutes "took Mary" instead of "took unto him his wife"; in verse 25 it has "and he lived with her in purity" instead of "and he knew her not." According to the citation of St. Ephrem, Tatian's Diatessaron had adopted this last reading also. Whether these facts show that the Curetonian and the Diatessaron correct the Lewis text, or *vice versa*, we shall see below.

b. The Ferrar group,² the Armenian version, and the old Latin texts represented by the codd. Bobbiensis,³ Veronensis,⁴ Colbertinus,⁵ Bezae,⁶ Sangermanensis,⁷ Frisingensis,⁸ and Vercellensis,⁹ are derived from the Syriac version, and show orthodox emendations of the heterodox text. We readily grant that these Latin texts show signs of derivation from the Syriac; all except one read, *e.g.*, Mary begat, instead of Mary bare which is best explained by the double meaning [gignere and parere, to beget and to bear] of the Syriac verb "iled"—but whether they are derived from the orthodox or the unorthodox Syriac text, is not determined thereby. Since their form is so similar to the Curetonian, that the agreement can hardly be ascribed to mere accident, we naturally infer that they are versions of the orthodox Syriac text. And if this be the case, they do not settle the question whether the primitive Syriac gospel-version was orthodox or heterodox.¹⁰

c. Another argument for the early date of the Sinaitic MS., or rather for the Syriac gospel-version contained in it, is based on the double fact that on the part of the Catholics the gospel was so explained as to maintain the perpetual virginity of Mary [by St. Chrÿsostom and Severus, *e.g.*], while on the part of heretics the testimony of the gospels was appealed to against the dogma of Mary's virginity. Mr. Harris's appeal to the method of Justin's apology is hardly conclusive on this point. The testimony of Epiphanius [Haer., xxx., 14], is more relevant: "The Cerinthians," Epiphanius says, "make use of St. Matthew's gospel as the

¹ *Contemporary Review*, l. c.

² Cf. Gregory, ii., p. 462, 13.

³ Of the fifth century; Gregory, iii., 960.

⁴ Of the fifth century; Gregory, iii., 954.

⁵ Of the twelfth century.

⁶ Of the sixth century.

⁷ Of the eighth century.

⁸ Of the sixth century.

⁹ Of the fourth century.

¹⁰ Cf. *Innsbrucker Zeitschrift*, 1895, ii., p. 395.

Ebionites do, on account of *the human genealogy*, though their copy is not entire. . . .” The Adoptionists too, add some weight to this argument, because they appealed to the history of our Lord’s baptism as proving their position. Now John, i., 34, of the Lewis MS. reads: “I saw and bare record that this is the *chosen* [not the Son] of God.” Their fourth gospel must therefore have resembled that preserved in the Syriac text of Sinai. Not to burden this proof with Mr. Harris’s allegation of several Latin MSS., it must be remembered that we freely admit that the Lewis gospels contain a text which may easily be interpreted in a heretical way; but the point at issue is the priority of this text as compared with other Syriac texts, especially the Curetonian. The arguments thus far advanced prove the existence of the Sinaitic text before the time of the foregoing heresies, perhaps before the time of the cited old Latin versions, but not before the origin of the Curetonian version.

2. The writers on the present subject do not agree in their explanation of the text-problem that is found in the first chapter of St. Matthew’s gospel.

a. Mr. Charles¹ unravels the knot by cutting it. Both the genealogy of Matthew and of Luke—in this latter, Mr. Charles identifies the clause “who was called the son of Joseph” with “who was the son of Joseph”—are written from an Ebionite point of view. Considering the fact that Tatian omits the genealogy, that Justin does not refer to it, that in several MSS. verse 18 begins with a capital letter, and that some add, in the margin, the rubric “incipit evangelium secundum Matthæum,” or “genealogia hucusque, incipit evangelium . . .” the learned writer infers that the genealogy of the first gospel was added to the Greek MSS. about 170 A.D. Besides, in the genealogy of the Lewis MS., “we have exactly what one would expect to find in a genealogy of Joseph.” But not one of these arguments can bear examination; the last remark is an *a priori* consideration; Tatian did not intend to copy the gospels, but to write a life of Jesus Christ according to the gospel-record; it cannot be expected of every apologist that he should make use of the whole gospel, so that Justin’s omission does not prove much; the accompaniments of verse 18 have been repeatedly explained more satisfactorily than they have been by Mr. Charles; finally, the Ebionites were so far from appealing to the genealogy of the first gospel, that they omitted the first two chapters entirely, and began their gospel of Matthew with the ministry of the Baptist.² Conybeare³ ends his refutation of Mr. Charles’s

¹ Academy, December 1, 1894.

² Cf. Epiph., adv. haer., xxix., 9; xxx., 13; *Les Études*, Janvier, 1895, p. 133.

³ Academy, December 8, 1894.

view with the words : " When Mr. Charles mutilates a text usually accounted sacred, he is in danger of falling into the predicament of the Chinaman who burned down his house in order to roast his pig."

b. Mr. Conybeare himself has not been successful in roasting the pig without falling into the Chinaman's error. According to him,¹ " the genealogy finds its only logical and possible conclusion in the new form of verse 16." " This," he believes, " all parties will admit." The Lewis text is no corruption of an originally orthodox text. The Sinaitic MS. represents, therefore, rather the attempted orthodox alteration of a primitive heretical version than *vice versa*. But what is to be said of the statement that Mary was found by Joseph with child of the Holy Ghost [18], that Joseph was minded to put Mary away secretly, and retained her only when he was reassured by an angel [19-20], that Mary is called " the Virgin " [16]? The facility with which Conybeare overcomes all these difficulties has rightly been styled enviable by one of his critics.

According to Philo,² the human soul comes directly from God : hence, " the Jews in the time of Christ deemed it possible and natural for a child to be conceived of the Holy Spirit, and yet at the same time to be begotten in the ordinary way. The two processes lay in different spheres. The one gave his soul or reason, which was a gift of the divine spirit, the other process gave his flesh, blood, and faculties of the sense."³ A similar view, Conybeare finds in the works of Philo,⁴ where the wives of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are said to be virtues ; they are said to have conceived of God, and to have borne sons to the patriarchs. " So it is," the writer infers, " that the angel assures Joseph that Mary has conceived the future Messiah of the Holy Spirit, and yet, in the same breath, bids him take his wife to himself and procreate the Messiah in the usual way. To the mind of Philo and his contemporaries there was nothing in such a command that was inconsistent and irreligious."⁵ Not to insist on the fact that according to this explanation, the phrase, " to conceive of the Holy Spirit," meant nothing extraordinary at all, and is, therefore, needlessly urged by the evangelist ; that again, Philo's allegory has nothing in common with the natural process of generating children ; we must point out that the gospel-text is not at all satisfied by the solution given. Where is the cause of Joseph's anxiety and doubt? why does he wish to dismiss Mary? surely, the con-

¹ Academy, November 17, 1894.

² Academy, November 17, 1894.

³ Academy, p. 401, col. 1, 1894.

² De opificio mundi, I, 32, 46.

⁴ Lib. de Cherub., 13.

ception of the Messiah's soul would not have caused the outward signs of pregnancy. And what about the visit of the angel? his joyful prediction of the birth of a son? To say, with Conybeare, that verses 19 and 20, in which all this is contained, are interpolations of carnally minded persons, incapable of understanding the spiritual meaning of the passage, is to acknowledge the impossibility of reconciling the theory of Conybeare with the present text of the Lewis MS. And if we must have recourse to mutilation of the text in order to effect the reconciliation, we fall into the mistake of the Chinaman. The suggestion of Badham¹ does not remedy this inconvenience. "The narratives of Virgin-birth," the writer thinks, "do not necessarily exclude St. Joseph altogether. It is only stated that Christ's birth was not due to any action or volition of his Mother's husband. When the rib was taken from Adam's side, Adam was unconscious." Though Simcox² finds this explanation "just as probable and just as edifying," it does not add anything to the solution of the problem involved in the Sinaitic gospel-text. If Joseph has taken, even unconsciously, part in the generation of Jesus, why should the angel tell him that the child was conceived of the Holy Spirit rather than of his natural father? Besides, the whole explanation is a pure hypothesis, advanced for the sole purpose of bolstering up the naturalism of the rationalists.

We need not add Conybeare's explanation of the addition "the Virgin" in verse 16; first, the addition is generally regarded as not genuine, since it would be difficult to account for its omission in all Greek codd. Secondly, Conybeare's explanation would deserve attention only if his solution of the problem were satisfactory; as it is, this minor point is buried in the ruin of his theory. Thirdly, Acts, vi., 1., Tertullian³, Clement of Alexandria⁴, and Ignatius⁵, show only that the particular writers considered widowhood in certain cases equal to virginity; but they do not prove that widows were generally called virgins in the earliest age of the Church; to explain, therefore, the addition "the Virgin" in verse 16 by recurring to these passages, is an open acknowledgement of one's incompetency to reconcile the addition with the rest of the passage.

c. According to Harris⁶, the Lewisian text is at the same time heretically corrupted and prior to the Curetonian. Mr. Harris gives a diagram showing the relation of the Sinai MS. to the other codd.: on the one side we have the genuine primitive reading as

¹ Academy, November 17, 1894.

² Academy, November 24, 1894.

³ De Exh. Cast., i.

⁴ Strom., vii., 12.

⁵ ad Smyrn., 13; cf. Lightfoot, Apostol. Fathers, ii., 324.

⁶ *Contemporary Review*, November, 1894.

preserved in the bulk of the best MSS., on the other a heretical corruption of the primitive text. The corrupted text has come down to us in two ways: in its unaltered corrupted form and in its excessive orthodox emendation. The Lewis MS. is a representative of the former, the Curetonian, the Diatessaron of Tatian, the Armenian version, the MSS. of the Ferrar group and some old Latin MSS. cited above, are exponents of the latter. Mr. Allen¹ is of opinion that no other hypothesis but that of the originality of the Lewis reading will satisfactorily account for the genesis on the one hand of the Received Text and on the other of the Curetonian and old Latin version of verse 16².

It is true that Mr. Harris's theory does not violate any dogma of faith; nor does it favor the rationalist school in their defence of naturalism. But it supposes a stupidity on the part of the heretics who corrupted the text that cannot be imputed to them unless solid proof be given for it. It would surely be absurd to change a few words in three verses and leave unchanged three or more entire verses which directly contradict the opinion intended to be established by the textual corruption. Moreover, the falsifiers would have added "the Virgin" in verse 16, thus deliberately weakening their own position. That Mr. Allen's contention concerning the derivation of the Received Text and of the old Latin and Curetonian from the Lewisian is groundless, we shall see presently.

d. The seeming contradiction in the first chapter of the gospel of St. Matthew in the Lewisian text is, after all, most satisfactorily explained by a writer in the "London Tablet."³ The text is not heretical but orthodox. That the virginal conception of Jesus is emphatically taught in the Sinaitic MS. has already been shown; the expressions "Joseph . . . begat Jesus" (16), "she shall bear thee a son" (21), "and she bare him a son, and he called his name Jesus" (25), are easily explained if we remember that Joseph was legally the father of Jesus. Joseph is therefore represented as the father of Jesus in the same sense in which Luke ii., 33, 48 calls him the father of our Lord. If we remember that the phrase "to raise up seed to his brother" was used in connection with the law of the Levirate, it will appear less incredible than it otherwise might, that the verb "begat" should be used of legal, not of physical fatherhood.

The orthodox character of the Lewis text once admitted, its origin is not hard to account for. First, the Curetonian and its dependent Latin versions are derived from the received text by

¹ Academy, December 15, 1894.

² Cf. *London Tablet*, January 5, 1895.

³ January 5, pp. 8f.

omission of "her husband" in verse 19, of "his wife" in verse 24, by changing the "husband of Mary" to "Joseph to whom was espoused" in verse 16, and finally by substituting "Mary thy espoused" in verse 20 instead of "Mary thy wife." These changes of the original text are the more probable, because the Curetonian may be supposed to have served in parts of the Church where, on account of the errors of Cerinthus, Carpocrates and similar heretics, Christians were apt to understand the genealogy in too naturalistic a sense. Verse 16 of the Curetonian reads then "Jacob begat Joseph, him to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin, she who bare (or begat) Jesus."

Secondly, substitute in this reading "Joseph" for the pronoun "him," and omit "she who" in conformity with the preceding members of the genealogy, and we obtain the Lewis reading "Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus." If we remember that the scribe may have been a Jewish Christian fully familiar with legal paternity, and habituated to express the relations between legal father and son in the same terms as those between natural father and son, the foregoing changes contain little or nothing strange. Whether they were made consciously or unconsciously, they did not convey to the writer or the intended reader any doctrine concerning Mary's virginity, different from that maintained in the Curetonian gospel-text. This derivation of the Lewis text from the Curetonian is confirmed by the following fact.¹ The printed text of the Sinai MS. shows a punctuation that is wholly abnormal in the changed form of the text, but fits exactly in the Curetonian reading. Must we not then infer that the scribe has changed the wording of the text according to the foregoing suggestion, but retained its punctuation? A glance at the two texts renders this clear: "Jacob begat Joseph Joseph to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin. begat Jesus." The Curetonian reads: "Jacob begat Joseph, him to whom was espoused Mary the Virgin, she who bare Jesus." The stop after "Virgin" in the former text is wholly meaningless, and cannot be understood unless we suppose that it has been retained from a primitive text like the Curetonian in which it had its proper meaning. It is true that in the present Curetonian MS. no stop is found after Virgin, but the MS. must not be identified with the text it represents, especially since the system of punctuation "which very intermittently prevails in the two Old Syriac MSS." demands a stop after "virgin." Moreover, the omission of "and he knew her not until" in verse 25 is certainly a corruption of the text, since this clause is found in every known MS. except the cod.

¹ Cf. *London Tablet*, January 5, 9, col. 1.

Bobbiensis. Of the colometry, too, or the division of the text into short sense-lines, which Mr. Harris believes to have been partially preserved by the cod. Bezae, and the Curetonian and the Lewis MSS., the traces in the last-named are much scarcer than in that of Cureton. All these details go far to show that the scribe of the Sinai MS. was not very particular about reproducing an exact copy, and render it therefore antecedently probable that the changes in the genealogy are attributable to him also.

As we have a number of MSS. preserving the variations of the Latin translation before the time of the Hieronymian Latin Vulgate, so we may regard the Curetonian and the Lewis MSS. as preserving variations of the Syriac version before the Syriac Vulgate or Peshitto came into general use. And though we cannot accept the ancient Syriac text on its own merit alone, without subjecting it to a close cross-examination, the Council of Trent urges us not to dismiss these old readings off hand and without giving them a proper hearing. For the Council declares the books of Holy Scripture as sacred and canonical in their integrity, adding, however, two conditions: 1. "As they are wont to be read in the Catholic Church." 2. "As they are had in the old Latin Vulgate edition." Since then the Syriac Church, even before adopting the Peshitto version as its Vulgate, was part of the "Ecclesia Catholica," the words of the Council impel us to a serious study of the MSS. containing the Scripture versions then used by the faithful. They may not be the light, but they are "to give testimony of the light." [*Cf.* John, i., 8.]

A. J. MAAS, S.J.

CONTROVERSY IN HIGH PLACES.

THE diocese of Salford, in England, is included in the diocese of Manchester. But the diocese of Salford is Catholic, and the diocese of Manchester is Protestant. The two "bishops" have recently been in conflict. Dr. Moorhouse, the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, publicly attacked the Catholic Church, and Dr. Billsborrow, the Catholic Bishop of Salford, publicly replied to Dr. Moorhouse. Both prelates delivered lectures to crowded audiences from the pulpits of their respective cathedrals. These lectures have since been published in pamphlet form. They treat chiefly of the subject of authority, very little being said about doctrine.

It would be difficult to compress the arguments of the combatants, and impossible to do so with justice. It is more to the point that we try to state their general principles, their starting-points and moods of disputation. The "challenge," which was contained in the Anglican bishop's first lecture, was summed up in the following sentence: that "the Roman claims necessitated a proof of the three following propositions: first, that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; second, that his prerogative of infallibility was held by him as bishop and not merely as apostle; and third, that his infallibility was in such sort attached to his office that it descended necessarily to all his successors in the Roman See." This challenge, with the Catholic bishop's reply, has been published in London and Manchester, and any one who desires to study the controversy will derive a vast amount of information.

But what we would do now is to study, not the details of the controversy—this would be a task of great length—but the principles on which both sides are argued, and the "spirit of faith" which is apparent. Throughout the whole of the controversy these principles and this spirit peep out, as it were, "between the lines." We feel that while we are discussing the "Petrine Claims," we are really watching the "good will" of the writers, and our conclusions are less drawn from the thrust and parry of the combatants than from the "attitude of mind" which is discernible. It is this attitude we should like now to contemplate. And we shall try first to sketch the polemical pose of Dr. Moorhouse with as much of distinctness as may be possible. Though the main question is the centre of authority, authority itself is the real point. Not so much "is there supreme living authority?" as "is

there any living authority at all?" is the question which we feel is being argued. And the conclusion which forces itself upon us is that Anglicanism is a repudiation of living authority, and not simply a repudiation of the Holy See.

The Catholic reader of the lectures of Dr. Moorhouse finds himself, as he turns over the pages, musing disturbedly in this fashion: Dr. Moorhouse seems to say that there are, necessarily, truths, but that there is no living teacher to define them. He seems to say that there is, necessarily, authority, but that it is impossible to be sure where it resides. He seems to say that there are heresies and schisms, but that no one can define or can punish them. He rejects the teaching authority of the Supreme Pontiff, but asserts his own authority to teach him. He proclaims that obedience is a Christian virtue, but limits its exercise to egotism. He abhors apostacy as one of the great sins, but denies that there is a high priest to judge it. He thinks that unity is a grace of Christian souls, but affirms that it should be a unity of differences. He acknowledges that Almighty God is One, but pronounces that His religion should be various.

Pages would not suffice for the enumeration of the fallacies which result from the attitude of Dr. Moorhouse. It has been well said, "you cannot reduce religion to a syllogism"; but it would be absurd to say, "there are no such things as first principles in the exercise of authority or obedience." First principles are the essentials of religion, and the first of first principles is to know "whom do I obey," and "why do I not obey myself?" Dr. Moorhouse cannot answer such questions. He has a hazy idea that Christian doctrines are divine only in the sense which is known to the mind of God, but human in the sense known to man, revelation having been a hint only of divine truths, which were not meant to be believed but opinionized. This hazy idea follows necessarily from the rejection of a living authority upon doctrine; for to say that every man is capable of creating a creed for himself out of his own private interpretation of the Bible, is to affirm that every intellect is endowed with infallibility, and every soul with the fulness of divine grace. And to shift the position to "obedience to primitive teaching" is equally disastrous to common sense; for it is no more possible for every man and every woman to master the whole of primitive teaching than to assure themselves of the occult, religious practices of the fugitives in the catacombs of Rome. In the very fact that Dr. Moorhouse can dispute with Dr. Billsborrow as to the interpretation to be put upon early writings, he concedes the fact that the interpretation of the Fathers is as difficult as the interpretation of the Scriptures. To be obliged to dispute about authority and doctrine is to admit

that there is no certainty as to either; just as, conversely, a Catholic never disputes about either, because divine faith gives the knowledge of both.

Let us call Dr. Benson to our aid, so as to strengthen the position of Dr. Moorhouse. Dr. Benson is Archbishop of Canterbury, and he has recently declared in a public utterance that Rome ought to conform to modern England, and not modern England to Rome. "If," said his Grace, "the Pope chooses to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles, we will come to an agreement with him. If not, no." And he said also that there "could be no reunion between the Established Church and the Church of Rome until the latter had abandoned her errors." Here we have the assertion (1) that the teaching authority of the Established Church is superior to the teaching authority of the Church of Rome; and (2) that by that superiority the Established Church rules that the Roman Catholic Church teaches errors. Let us examine these two candid assertions. We shall be criticising Dr. Moorhouse at the same time.

Now (1) if the teaching authority of the Established Church be superior to the teaching authority of the Church of Rome, on what basis does it rest its superiority? The authority to teach truths must come either from dispensation or from a commission which no Christian can dispute. Does the Christian dispensation, do the Gospels or Epistles, contain one word which would justify the assertion that the modern Church of England should teach the world? Where are the promises to the so-called Church of England? Where are the promises to Dr. Benson or Dr. Moorhouse, to the Committee of the Privy Council, or to the Convocation? There are none. But say that the authority was given by a divine favor in the time of Henry VIII. or Queen Elizabeth. We do not find anything in the character of those two monarchs which would justify a belief in their apostolicity. This may seem to be a playful view of the subject, but it is, on the contrary, a most stern, a most grave one. It is the very kernel of the whole question; it must be answered. The Church of Rome is called upon by Dr. Benson, and equally by the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, to submit to the superior authority of their Establishment. Why? What credentials can the Establishment show to us? We all know the credentials of the Church of Rome. "Thou art Peter," was the conferring of credentials, which even the mind of a child could understand. But neither in the Bible, nor in tradition, nor in primitive teaching, nor in all history, can we discover even a hint of the divine authority of that institution which was founded by Queen Elizabeth's Acts of Parliament. "Quis te misit, Dr. Benson?" Dr. Moorhouse has not attempted to enlighten us.

But (2) the superiority of the teaching authority of Dr. Benson gives him power to affirm, as it were pontifically, that the Roman Catholic Church "teaches errors." Let us accept the assertion, and try the consequences. The Catholic Church teaches errors, but the Protestant Establishment does not. At least we must presume so, because, if the Establishment taught errors, the Archbishop of Canterbury would anathematize them. More than this, the Archbishop of Canterbury, being endowed with a teaching divine authority which is superior to that of the Supreme Pontiff, would define (and with more exactness than does the Pontiff) the truth to be believed by all Anglicans. Has he done so? Has he ruled, say, the true doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament, in contradiction to the various heresies of his countrymen? On the contrary, he has advised "peace" between heretics, and a happy comminglement of their "errors." Then since the Archbishop of Canterbury approves of "errors" in his own church; recommends amiability between such clergy and such peoples as hold exactly opposite doctrines; positively declines—though professedly competent—to define truths, or to anathematize so much as one of a hundred "errors"; we may ask with what consistency can he demand of the Supreme Pontiff that he should submit himself to Canterbury. Infallibility? The Supreme Pontiff according to the ruling of Dr. Benson, teaches errors to all Catholics in the world, and so far he asserts his teaching power; but the Archbishop of Canterbury is so helpless that he cannot teach anything at all, except the duty of *not* caring about errors. If we had to choose between two teachers; the one who said, "I anathematize all errors, and can and will teach you divine truths," and the other who said, "I have no power to teach you truths, and can only advise you to try to harmonize errors"; even if we did not accept the first, we should say to the second, "you confess yourself to be no Christian teacher."

But Dr. Moorhouse, the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, is not responsible for the weakness of his primate, he is only responsible for himself. Now in what position does Dr. Moorhouse find himself, in his relation to the Archbishop of Canterbury? Does he obey him in doctrinal definition? Certainly not. He would care no more for his ruling on any one doctrine of the faith than he would care for that of any curate in his diocese. Then for whose ruling does he care? Supposing that the two Houses of Convocation were to meet in sacred conclave to-morrow, and were to define the doctrine, say, of the sacramental real presence, would the Bishop of Manchester implicitly accept the definition, provided the Archbishop of Canterbury endorsed it? He would care no more for such fantastic promulgation than he would care for a decree by

his butler. He knows that the "opinions" of his right reverend brethren are the results of individual bias; and that they would not have even a foundation of truth in them, except for what has been learned from the Catholic Church. Then to whom does he look for definition? Not to the Supreme Pontiff, for he disowns him. Not to general councils, for he claims the right to choose their number, and their value as œcumenically binding; and, further still, claims the right to interpret all their teachings, without reference to any living authority. Not to any written ruling of primitive authority would Dr. Moorhouse yield implicit obedience, nor to any audible voice of living authority in the whole world, except on the condition that his own personal *placet* should ratify the authoritative decision. Here then we have a "Poper" which, while being confessedly Protestant, is confessedly fatal to all authority. It has been humorously observed that, in the Protestant rule of faith, every one is infallible except the Pope; but the assertion is too generous, for really no one is infallible except he happens to agree with the *egomet*. Dr. Moorhouse would acknowledge the inerrancy of Dr. Benson, provided Dr. Benson agreed with him; and Dr. Benson would return the compliment to Dr. Moorhouse, on the same somewhat restricted understanding. So that when we are reading such "teachings" of Dr. Benson as have been quoted in an earlier page, or such controversial egotism as we find in the lectures which have been published by the Bishop of Manchester, we naturally ask ourselves, whom do these gentlemen obey, what or where is their Ecclesia Docens? It is not the Bible, for they interpret it for themselves, and make it "teach" whatever doctrines they prefer. As to the Anglican formularies—which fifty years ago meant "rank Protestantism," but are said now to mean ritualism or "quasi Romanism"—they make no claim to teach anything but compromise, and have been an admirable success in that character. As to the Thirty-Nine Articles, which an Anglican clergyman, Mr. Byrne, has described as "a farrago of nonsense," they were drawn up expressly to "catch all fish except Papists," and have done so for three hundred years. We must be allowed then to ask Dr. Moorhouse, and also his primate, Dr. Benson, to whom do you look for authority? Both these prelates have been recently scolding Catholics both for their principle of obedience to living authority, and for their imputing such authority to the Holy See. But what would they give us in exchange? If they take away the existence of living authority, they necessarily take away obedience; or, if they repudiate obedience, they repudiate living authority, to which alone obedience can be rendered. We think it hard to be anathematized by these prelates for two principles which we had supposed to be Christian.

"There is no living authority but private judgment," is an axiom we must venture to reject. Sound doctrine must be assured by living authority; and as all Catholics believe in sound doctrine, and not in their private whims and caprices, they believe in living authority; without which they would be in the position of the unhappy Dr. Moorhouse and Dr. Benson.

II.

We turn now to the "attitude" of Dr. Billsborrow, and we feel ourselves at last on solid ground. In his first Lecture he quotes the Protestant Bishop of Liverpool, who says that "the unhappy divisions in his own communion have grown deeper and wider than ever, until they are now not only perilous, but hopeless"; and he makes the remark that the Bishop of Manchester might be more profitably occupied in trying to lessen these divisions than in imputing "errors" to the one Church of God. He proceeds to trace the notes and characteristics of the true Church, as being the opposite of those of the Established Church, and he dwells historically on the connection between the Church's power and the gradual unfolding of her definitions. And at this point we may stop to ask both Dr. Moorhouse and Dr. Benson, what would their Established Church have done in the time of Arius, of Nestorius, of Eutyches? How could Canterbury (in modern sense) have anathematized their heresies or defined the "Consubstantiality," the "Personality," the "Hypostatic Union?" Imagination itself recoils from the absurdity of supposing that the definitions of the Established Church would have any weight with modern Anglicans; indeed, it may be said that most Anglicans are so indifferent that they care but little what the General Councils defined, or whether they themselves were anathematized. But to return to the Catholic bishop. He proceeded to dwell critically on the "separate powers" of the priesthood, the episcopate and the apostolate, affirming that "though St. Peter had the apostolate in common with the eleven, Our Lord reserved to him certain prerogatives which gave him superiority over them, and made him the head of the Church, the source of its jurisdiction, and the centre and bond of its unity." And on the point of jurisdiction the bishop asks Dr. Moorhouse: "When a bishop is consecrated, who gives him authority to exercise his new powers? Who assigns him his mission to his diocese? For to give mission, to confer jurisdiction, being a purely spiritual act, is exclusively the gift of our Lord, and without it none of the powers He has committed to His Church for its government and the salvation of souls can be exercised." And, lastly, passing on to the positively ludicrous unreality of supposing that Dr. Benson can

be "successor" of St. Augustine, St. Anselm or St. Thomas, the bishop shows that the new Erastianism of Elizabethanism is so exactly the opposite of the "spirituality" which was accepted by English Catholics for a thousand years, that the royal supremacy and the modern Canterbury have no more to do with Catholic government than they have to do with defining Catholic truth.

We need not linger on the treatment of the "Petrine claims"—most admirably wrought out by Dr. Billsborrow—but will confine ourselves to noting the attitude of the Catholic mind as opposed to the attitude of the Anglican mind.

We notice in the Catholic bishop's attitude (1) that he postulates the duty of obedience, not on one only but on all points of faith, which is the same thing with postulating that there is a living authority which is divinely inerrant in its teaching. But the Anglican bishop seems to imply that it is impossible for any Christian to be obedient on all points of faith, for the simple reason that he has no one to teach him what constitutes the whole Christian creed. Any Anglican may take what "view" he pleases, not of two sacraments only but of seven; his obedience being rendered only to his own apprehension of what may just possibly have been the mind of the early church. And since no two Anglicans are precisely in accord as to what this early teaching may have been—that is, on *all* points of the Christian faith—it follows that the *Ecclesia Docens* must be enshrined in each bosom, equally with the clergy and the laity. (2) The Catholic bishop contends that the Holy Spirit of God has at all times guided His Church into all truth; while the Anglican bishop contends that the Father of lies has been the teacher of most Catholic doctrines. Even on the most elementary and paramount question, the divine order of the government of the Church, the whole Church, says Dr. Moorhouse, went wrong from the beginning in the believing a lie about the primacy; so that to this day the only church in all Christendom which affects to have teaching authority is universally abandoned to the most certain conviction that the Pope is Christ's vicar on earth. Here we have a dilemma which is baffling. The church of Christ is supposed to teach all truth, and all Christians are supposed to believe all truth; but the Anglican bishop's creed is converted into the formula, "I believe what the Catholic Church does *not* teach, because her government is based on a falsehood." And when pressed with the question, "Since you disbelieve the Catholic Church and affirm that her authority is a fiction, *whom* do you accept for your teacher?" the answer, if honestly given, must be, "I obey myself, who am superior to all churches and pontiffs." Yet since some refuge must be found from such a profession of faith—as being impossible for any Christian who is in

earnest—that refuge is this: “I obey the early church provided I may decide what it teaches.” Thus one abyss seems to call to another. Now, though we may condole with a bishop of the establishment who is driven into humiliating straits, we cannot see how he can assail the Catholic position as being less wise or reasonable than his own. Catholics at least know whom they obey, why they obey, when they obey; they can never have a doubt about their orthodoxy, nor about their peril of falling into heresy; but Anglicans can only be confident of their orthodoxy when they implicitly obey their own selves, and can only entertain a fear of being heretics when they disesteem their interior Holy See. (3) The Catholic bishop maintains that all the doctors and all the saints, as well as scores of generations of faithful Catholics—from, say, the fourth or fifth to the sixteenth century—were probably better judges of what was primitive teaching than is any Anglican bishop of the present day. The Anglican bishop maintains that true enlightenment as to primitive teaching was first enjoyed by the English king, Henry VIII., after he had put away his lawful wife, and, perhaps, also by a German monk, who, after breaking his own vows, persuaded a Catholic nun to do the same, and that some two hundred and fifty sects outside Anglicanism, and a good many more sects inside Anglicanism, are the true heirs of the primitive teaching of the Church. (The Czar’s Church is so notoriously a political machine, founded and kept going from political motives, that it need not count in any discussion of the question. Besides, the Czar’s Church anathematizes the Church of England for every one of its innumerable heresies, save, perhaps, the heresy of the royal supremacy.) (4) The Catholic bishop affirms that, in regard to holy orders, there must be the legitimate conference of jurisdiction, and that without such legitimate conference some of the functions of true order would be void. This jurisdiction must be derived from a spiritual source; it cannot be derived from a temporal. But the Anglican bishop seems to think that even spiritual jurisdiction can be conferred by a purely lay power; the Anglican bishops holding their right of jurisdiction by the gifts of a sovereign or a prime minister. This at once reduces spiritual jurisdiction to the level of purely temporal jurisdiction, since it is impossible for the lesser to confer the greater. A sovereign or a prime minister, having no spiritual character, no spiritual authority or holy order—not even so much as a subdiaconate—it follows that a lay personage cannot give what he has not, cannot impart what he has never received. Hence the Anglican bishops have no jurisdiction; they have only lay appointment to offices. So that, even supposing that they possessed holy order, they would have no right to exercise their functions, except in special cases,

which it is unnecessary to go into, because the Anglican Church knows nothing of them. (5) And as to the question of holy order, the Catholic bishop lays it down that the Holy See is supreme judge of its validity. For, though the question of, say Anglican order, is a question as to matters of facts, and the Holy See is not infallible on such incidents, yet it involves a large variety of considerations which come within the doctrinal sphere. So that the practice of the Holy See, in disallowing Anglican order, is less a judgment as to the history of its origin than as to the lapse of its validity from many causes.

We have only given a few of the impressions which were forced on us by the reading of this controversy, scarcely touching upon the staple subject of the lectures, which is the historical vindication of the pontificate. That historical vindication has been often attempted in this REVIEW, and Bishop Billsborrow has but added wealth to sufficiency. Let us now, in conclusion, take a very great question, which is at this time much talked of in England, and consider it in its relations to this controversy. The question is, "the Reunion of the Churches." We shall see how the "attitude" of Bishop Billsborrow completely dispels every difficulty, and how the "attitude" of Dr. Moorhouse would render reunion equally impracticable and unreal. It does not seem to occur to Dr. Moorhouse, when he is cutting away the ground from all authority, that he is at the same time making war upon our ordinary obligations, and upon some of the higher states of Christian virtue. The root of perfection, as of obligation, being obedience to supernatural authority, Dr. Moorhouse would first destroy the root, and then argue about the nature of the fruits.

III.

"Reunion," as it is called—though there cannot be reunion between opposites which were never united—can only be effected by the conceding of superior power to one or other of the opposites to be united. If the Church of England and the Catholic Church have exactly the same power—that is, the same supernatural authority—it is obvious that neither can dictate to the other, can presume to utter the mandate, "obey." But, if they have not the same power, one or the other must have the greater; and here it is that the Manchester controversy enables us to see our way clearly. The Protestant bishop says that both churches have the same power, because neither of them has the power to teach the other; so that "the same power" means "no power," no divine gift of inerrancy, no commission to "go, teach all nations." Then if neither has the power to teach the other, neither can have the

right to teach the other; hence, it necessarily follows that there can be no obligation to inquire into, and to embrace, the one truth. Almighty God having made it impossible that Christians should know what is the whole faith—and this is the inference from Dr. Moorhouse's position, though his lordship might shrink from admitting it—there cannot be any obligation to intellectually consider what can never be intellectually known. Hence heresy, schism, and the like are hypotheses in the Anglican rule of faith; they cannot have real existence, because both heresy and schism mean resistance to divinely ordered authority. But there is no such thing as divinely ordered authority. If there were, every Christian must obey it. But since every Christian is at liberty to make choice of his own church, his own private interpretation of the Fathers, his own private interpretation of the Scriptures—a Protestant bishop in England, a Catholic bishop in Spain, and an Orthodox bishop in Moscow, being all (theoretically) on the same footing—it follows that heresies and schisms are absolute impossibilities, or that they are at best only geographical accidents. "Unity" becomes a fanciful ideal, and Dr. Moorhouse must call it Utopian. Nay, we must go so far as to say that unity would be wrong, for it would be the aspiring to a condition which is both impossible in fact and not authorized by the divine dispensation. The only alternative, the only escape from these pleadings, is to affirm that true doctrine and false doctrine are equally pleasing to Almighty God, and so we may be all united in indifference. But no one dares to say this, for it is impious; and therefore such fictions as "obedience to the early church," "respect for primitive teaching," or "a preference for (the private estimate of) the Scriptures," are made to do duty for obedience to authority and unity in all Christian belief.

Reunion, then, in the philosophy of Dr. Moorhouse, is but a dream which the intellect rejects, though the soul may perhaps sigh for its beauties. Yet here we have an obvious contradiction, for the intellect and the soul cannot possibly be disunited, since pure reason and pure faith must go together. Which then of the two bishops shall we approve? In the philosophy of the Catholic bishop, reunion is very simple; for it means the submission of the human and the errant to the supernatural—the infallible—to God. Either reject Christianity altogether (is the conclusion we derive from this controversy), as a revelation of the whole truth to be believed, or accept the living authority which God has placed in the world, to counsel, to teach, to command. Dr. Moorhouse makes reunion impossible. Bishop Billsborrow makes it easy and blessed.

IV.

We have seen then that this controversy about the supremacy of the Holy See, and about all that is involved in that supremacy, is really a controversy as to the very existence of authority, and therefore as to the very existence of a pure faith. It is a controversy which indeed involves almost the whole of the Christian life; for just as doctrine must depend upon authority, so must discipline, order, or regularity. Morals also are included in the question; for who shall say—to take one example—that the question of divorce is not a question of morals, involving almost the whole of domestic order? The Church of England has had to condone legal divorce, to sanction it though she could not approve it; nor has Canterbury ventured, in so much as faltering tones, to reprove the Parliament which has broken Christian law. Throughout the Christian world the only authority which has insisted on the sacramental estimate of marriage or which has insisted on the truth that whom God has joined together no man and no parliament can put asunder—is that authority which claims inerrancy in morals as well as on all points of faith. Now if the Church of England had maintained that the spiritual authority must be supreme in the determining of spiritual law, she could not have bowed the head to modern enactments which have set the spiritual law at defiance. But having asserted—as Dr. Moorhouse asserts—that there is no headship in Christian authority; that each bishop of each kingdom, or of each so-called National Church, is independent in the exercise of his judgment, save so far as he is dependent on the State, it follows that all the members of a National Church become enslaved to a secular parliament, and can enjoy no protection from their bishops. In Catholic countries, when the State passes a law which the clergy regard as unchristian, they at once appeal to the supreme spiritual authority for counsel in their difficult position. No matter what the temporal consequences may be, Cæsar must give place to God. But the unhappy position of such prelates as Dr. Moorhouse obliges them to defer to that authority which gives them their spiritual jurisdiction. Having conceded the principle that the State rules the Church; and also conceded the principle that there is no inerrant authority which has power to determine right or wrong; there is nothing left but to “shrug the shoulders,” and say, “the position is unfortunate, but we must put up with it as the price of our liberties.”

Take one more example, a question only of discipline, in the sense that it is outside of faith and morals; we allude to the celibacy of the clergy. During the last few weeks English newspapers have been busy in publishing a great number of letters with some

such heading as "Ought Clergymen to Marry?" A person who called himself "A Catholic Priest," began the pleading; and asserted that not a few of the Catholic clergy desired to be freed from their bonds. One or two other "Catholic priests" took his side, and declared that the great obstacle to reunion was this unreasonable insistence on celibacy. Now here we have an opportunity of testing the full value of Dr. Moorhouse's private estimate of authority, not on a matter of faith or of morals, but on a point of (admittedly severe) discipline. It is obvious that, in considering this question, we cannot separate the fitness from the authority; for it is the authority which must determine the fitness of celibacy, and which must be proved to be competent to do so. Now let us inquire what is the nature of that authority, we mean, of course, Catholic authority, which determines the question of the fitness of celibacy; and not only determines it, but proves it? If the Church of England was called upon to discuss the fitness, we know what that sort of "authority" would say; and we know it by the whole history of a church which has been everything in the world save supernatural. But when we ask Catholic authority to discuss it, we know that we are asking an authority which has judged supernaturally since the day of Pentecost. We are appealing to an authority which has ruled such tremendous truths, truths which would be terrible to the intellect, were they not begotten of divine love, as the Sacramental Real Presence, forgiveness in the Sacrament of Penance, purgatorial suffering and cleansing, or the efficacy of prayer for departed souls. We carry our minds back to Ephesus, or Nicea, to Trent, or to the last Council of the Vatican, and we ponder the nature, the divine character, of the truths which were pronounced to be necessary to salvation, and which received their final authority from the Pope; and, in doing this, we are able to estimate the nature, the divine character, of that authority which now approves clerical celibacy. The same authority which infallibly ruled the dogmas in regard to the two natures of the Son of God; which has anathematized, through a period of nineteen centuries, every heretic and schismatic who has disturbed the Church; has also ruled the fitness of the unmarried state for priests who stand daily at the altar, and who sit daily in the tribunal of penance. Now this fitness, which is no doubt debatable in itself, because it is not included in the articles of the faith, and is only binding disciplinarily upon priests, is yet to be measured, not only by the nature of the functions of every Catholic priest, but by the nature of the authority which prescribes it. And it is just here that the controversy between Dr. Billsborrow and Dr. Moorhouse should be valuable to all classes of Protestants. Dr. Moorhouse, in pulling down ecclesiastical authority to a level which is human

or opinionative, utterly destroys the possibility of discipline, in the sense in which Catholics understand it. Discipline must be harmonious with authority; and if you strip authority of every shred of the supernatural, you must necessarily do the same thing with discipline. We can quite understand that, in the Church of England, clerical celibacy would be incongruous; it would have no fitness with the functions of the State Church, or with doctrines which are as uncertain as the wind. But in the Catholic Church an unmarried priesthood is congruous with Holy Mass and with penance, with the certainty of the validity of holy order, with the whole of the supernatural, Catholic faith, and, as we have said, with the authority of the Holy See, and with all that is involved in its inerrancy. And it is this fitness of the discipline with the authority which shows which is the true Catholic Church. It is this fitness which, while it involves much self-sacrifice, shows the supernaturalness of the faith. The two or three "Catholic priests" (if they be so) who have written their lamentations to the newspapers, and have expressed their own preference for married life, ought to have mentioned, that like Dr. Moorhouse, they disesteemed living authority, because it interfered with their ease.

We need not go further into the argument. Our object has been to show that the position of Dr. Moorhouse is fatal to doctrine and to discipline, because it is fatal to authority. If we may judge the authority we may judge what it ordains; so that Dr. Moorhouse is consistent in judging Catholic doctrines and in selecting his own doctors and interpreters. And, in the same way, if he may judge the Church's doctrines, he may judge every detail of its discipline, since a merely human authority must be as imperfect in discipline as it must be errant in doctrines and morals. In short, all is human, all is doubtful. It is refreshing, then, to return to the Catholic bishop, and to see how he puts us on solid ground. He insists on the divinity of the Christian dispensation from beginning to end and in all time. He affirms that a divine institution requires, and possesses, living authority, and that this living authority must be as visible as it is audible, so that all the world may see it and know it. He repudiates the theory of national churches (in which each church may approve its own heresies) as being irreverent to the divine unity, disobedient to the law of Christ and fatal to the unity of Christians. He will have it that the Incarnation was the assurance of all truth; that the divine faithfulness has kept the divine promises; and that divine justice compels obedience to that authority which was planted on earth to teach the nations. Here, then, we have the true note of Catholicity. There can be no doubt about "which is the church." As in the judgment of Solomon, so we may say of the Catholic

Church, "Give her the child, for she is the mother thereof." Nor can we understand how any Anglican who attentively studies these lectures—reading both sides of the controversy—can hesitate in his judgment as to on which side is the common sense, on which side the greater reverence for truth. Certain of the details of the controversy may be disputable; for, in the going back to what was written in the earliest centuries, there is necessarily a good deal wanted besides scholarship. There must be the apprehension of the correlative history of the period, of all the indirect influences and pressures. Above all, there must be the key of intuition; so that the Christian inquirer may interpret what is ambiguous by what he knows as to the certainties of the faith. And it is this "key" which the Catholic possesses. He holds in his hand the lamp of the Catholic faith, by which he investigates the dark places; whereas the Anglican has no lamp but private judgment, and its flickerings disturb his spiritual vision. If even in judging of what occurs to-day private judgment is proved to be untrustworthy, what must it be in judging of those troubled times when paganism was at war with Christianity, or imperialism was striving for the mastery? We know that for the first two or three centuries there was necessarily reserve in Christian teaching. The catacombs were the cathedrals and the universities, and when we meet with a distinct utterance of authority we know what must have been the cost of it to the persecuted. Such reflections make us wary and reverential in our "attitude" towards the very early teachers. We do not ask ourselves—we ask living authority—to guide us in "antiquarian" researches. Take away that living authority and we are no more competent to fix the meaning of all the teachings of all the fathers on all the truths than are we competent to fix the meaning of the "many other things which Jesus did," but which are not recorded in the Gospels, or of that "guidance into all truth" which followed the Day of Pentecost, and which is inherited by the holy Catholic Church.

A. F. MARSHALL.

ITALY'S SILVER JUBILEE.

"And thou shalt sanctify the fiftieth year, and shalt proclaim remission to all the inhabitants of thy land: for it is the year of jubilee. Every man shall return to his possession, and every one shall go back to his former family."—LEVITICUS, xxv., 10.

THE jubilee is scriptural. It is distinctively a theocratic institution. It was a year of joy, when debts were discharged, and bondage ceased, and men entered into their possessions. The custom of the jubilee has been revived in the Church in a spiritual sense. The ecclesiastical jubilee occurs regularly every twenty-five years. It is a period of remission and indulgence, when people confess their sins and give alms to the poor, and are invited to enter into their inheritance which is the grace of Christ. The name, jubilee, has been adopted in secular language to indicate certain anniversary celebrations and commemorations of events that are supposed to have brought great joy into the world. There is the golden jubilee of fifty years; and the silver jubilee, of twenty-five. The Kingdom of United Italy is nearing its twenty-fifth year, and the keeping of its silver jubilee has been at least dimly hinted at. What are the glories which United Italy will rehearse to us upon the dawn of her silver jubilee?

We are witnesses of what no other generations of men have ever witnessed. For twenty-five years we have seen two sovereigns reigning in the same city—one the rightful sovereign, the other an usurper. The usurper is sitting in the palace of the rightful sovereign and is making laws for him. The rightful sovereign has not gone beyond the bounds of what the usurper accords to him as a "residence" for five and twenty years: and yet the great ones of the earth make journeys of many days to pay court to him in his solitude. You know whom I would name: the Pope and the Prince of the house of Savoy, who is styled the King of "Italy." Who has ever seen two independent sovereigns in the same city. What is the meaning of the double representation of the European courts at Rome—one to the Pope and one to the King? It is a diplomatic absurdity such as Europe wide awake has never before been guilty of.

What is Italy? If we look at the peninsula called Italy, as we find it on the maps after the downfall of Napoleon I. and the treaty of Vienna (1815), we shall find that Italy then embraced, besides the Kingdom of Lombardy and Venice (under Austrian rule), nine independent states: Sardinia, the two Sicilies, the

Grand Duchy of Tuscany, the Duchies of Parma, Lucca and Modena, the Republic of San Marino, the Principality of Monaco, and the states of the Church. In 1847 Lucca was united to Tuscany in consequence of a marriage. In 1859-60, Victor Emmanuel, King of Sardinia, sacrificing his saintly daughter to the Prince of Paris (Plon-Plon), and sacrificing Savoy and Nice to the ambition of Napoleon III., by the latter's aid or connivance, in the right of might, annexed Lombardy, Tuscany, Parma, Modena, the two Sicilies, and a part of the states of the Church, and even in 1861 he assumed the title of the King of Italy.¹ In 1866, by reason of an alliance with Prussia, when Prussia bore down upon Austria, he acquired Venetia; and in 1870 he entered Rome. The dream of a United Italy seemed to be realized. So much for the plight of nations. So much for the Congress of Vienna where Cardinal Consalvi, the Papal envoy, had been received as the representative of the most ancient dynasty of Europe; where the territorial independence of the Pontiff was accepted as essential to the peace of the continent; and where the nations pledged themselves to see collectively that that independence should be guarded inviolate.

When Victor Emmanuel entered Rome in 1870 he said: "This is the overthrow of the House of Savoy." About a year before his death he said, whilst gazing one day at the Vatican which held the captive Pius IX.: "There is a prisoner here in Rome who is not the Pope." He referred to himself. And now, after so many years from the occupation, a story is told which may explain why he called himself a prisoner in Rome. Victor Emmanuel was the natural ally of the French Emperor. He was the debtor of France and of Napoleon III. Napoleon III. had, previous to 1870, fought his battles, won his victories, and made his conquests. The sympathies of Victor Emmanuel were with Napoleon III. and the French people. Very naturally, therefore, when Prussia was planning the campaign of 1870, and the downfall of Napoleon III., the Iron Chancellor had to fear lest the Sardinian King might at any moment yield to an impulse of gratitude and cast his arms into the balance on the side of Napoleon III. With the single exception of Sig. Sella, the whole ministry of Emmanuel leaned with the king toward the French alliance; Bismarck, therefore, opened negotiations with the radical section of the Italian parliament. Through the aid of Cucchi, an old Garibaldian, he drowned the fears of the radicals, and by the united efforts of Cairoli, Crispi and Nicotera, the tide of public opinion was turned

¹ Up to the experiment of to-day, Italy has never been one kingdom. Rome has never been the capital of Italy. Under the Roman Emperors the peninsula was inhabited by widely different peoples who formed part of a great confederation called the Roman Empire.

against the French alliance. The question was then raised of taking Rome as the capital of a United Italy. Victor Emmanuel was weak. He feared that resistance to the cry of the radicals might cost him, at their unscrupulous hands, even the crown he wore. So Napoleon fell and the Piedmontese entered Rome. The unification of Italy, in the minds of those who had thus brought it about, was regarded as a necessary preliminary step to the destruction of all hereditary rule in Italy and to the destruction of the Papal government. They saw from the beginning the impossibility of setting up the rule of red-republicanism in any of the kingdoms, duchies, principalities, that composed the geography of the peninsula. Such a foundation would have been immediately torn up by affrighted neighbors. Hence, wise in their generation, their project has been to unite the separate parts of the geographical expression, piece by piece, under the most powerful crown, previous to hurling the crown in the dust at a single blow. The taking of Rome was the last step in unification, which is the first requirement for dissolution. This did not escape Cavour, the originator of the actual unity. As early as 1861 (March 25), he declared from the tribune that the placing of the seat of government at Rome, so as to interfere with the liberty of the Pope, would be "fatal not only to Catholicism but to Italy." And Gino Capproni, whose ashes have been placed in the Pantheon beside those of Victor Emmanuel, said, before the taking of Rome: "I believe that the Pope must have a city where there will be no one above him; and I believe that that city must be Rome; and I believe that Rome would be a bad capital for Italy." After Rome had been taken, the same Capproni, blind and feeble, entered the Senate at Florence and spoke these foreboding words: "Beware! On the independence of the head of the Church depends our independence; if this independence is not secured we shall never possess Rome really and in security."

Nevertheless, Rome was taken, as has been said; and, immediately, that they might wear before the eyes of the world the garb of liberators, the Piedmontese held what they called a plebiscite, or vote of the people, for or against the Papal rule. The day was announced. The polls were taken possession of; and, by a system of terrorism which prevented honest men from approaching the polls, the invaders were able to telegraph over the world that night that 46 votes had been cast for Papal rule, and 40,000 votes against it. There is a marble slab inserted into the front of the Capitol, on which is inscribed the legend, that in the plebiscite after the taking of Rome, the city was chosen as the capital of Italy by a vote of 298,000 against 48 votes. Whatever the numbers may have been, one thing is certain, the vote was cast by the

scum of Italy, which had come into Rome in the wake of the invading troops. The plebiscite was not a vote of the Roman people, but a Piedmontese governmental falsehood. This is proved by the immediately preceding demonstrations of the people in favor of Pius IX., when the invaders were at the gates. The desire of the people to fall upon the invaders proves it; a desire which Pius IX. saw would end in needless bloodshed, and hence discountenanced. The fact that not a sign of exultation was given on the Corso over the triumph proves it. The shop-doors were all closed as in mourning, and the drapery that always marks the Roman festal day was not seen upon one balcony on the day named for the celebration. The fact that the palaces and dwellings hung out foreign flags as for protection against an enemy proves it. The protest of the Roman voters, signed with name and residence, proves it. There was not one journal for the invaders established by a Roman. An effort was made to blind the public by keeping the former officials; but they would not hold office under the Piedmontese. The Piedmontese could not find so much as a satisfactory city council of native Romans. But, without going farther, the plebiscite itself is proof enough. It was the vote of a mob of ruffians, of criminals and of aliens.

But the invaders were ill at ease. In the face of the world they had to make some profession. So they passed the famous law of guarantees, by which they professed to secure to the Pontiff absolute independence, and free control of Catholic institutions in Rome and in the six suburban vicariates. The law was put into execution by stripping the Pontiff of his possessions. On November 7, 1870, less than two months after the invasion, General la Marmora sent word to Pius IX. that the Quirinal Palace, the Papal residence, would have to become the property of the state. Pius refused to cede it. A blacksmith was called in; the locks were forced; and on November 10th the "*Gazetta Ufficiale del Regno d'Italia*" announced: "Yesterday at noon, the king took possession of the Quirinal." The Pope was allowed the Vatican as a "residence." The guarantees were a lie from the beginning. The "residence" has been turned into a prison. The Sardinians, or Piedmontese—to use the names indifferently—have had control of the telegraphs, the railroads, the mails, and of all means of communication between the Pope and the Church. Besides, the usurper arrogates to himself the power of a "veto" over the appointment of bishops and pastors. Two years ago, there were as many as forty bishops excluded from their sees and prohibited entrance into the houses built for them by the faithful of the dioceses. To understand how free the living Pope is to appear in public, we have but to call to mind the outrages of the mob that

attacked the dead body of Pius IX. on the night of September 20, 1881, when it was being carried to the tomb in the cemetery of St. Lawrence.

Italy is posing before the world to-day as a great nation, with a huge army and an exceptionally formidable navy. In 1882, the fleet numbered 117 vessels, with 9400 sailors; in 1892, it had grown to 329 vessels, with 21,000 sailors. In 1882, the total available army force was 1,986,000 men; in 1892, 3,027,000 men. She has also her million of civil officials, with all the apparatus that so many officials imply. All this demands a large revenue. Money is required to carry on a kingdom—and such a kingdom. What are the capabilities of the sources from which a revenue necessarily so enormous must be drawn? As early as 1861, when Victor Emmanuel first took the title of King of Italy, after the seizure of the whole of the peninsula, with the exception of some of the estates of the Church, the government expenditure was \$151,000,000, and the deficit that year was \$60,000,000.¹ But, from the beginning, the Church was called upon to pay the debts of the usurping government. The spoliation of Church property for the single year 1867 was reckoned at \$116,000,000. In 1870, after the taking of Rome, when the era of Italian splendor began, this method of raising a revenue was applied with fitting magnificence to the whole peninsula. Hundreds upon hundreds of churches and monasteries, whose inmates were driven out, were seized, and either torn down, sold at auction, or turned into barracks or brothels. For twenty-five years the work has gone on. Church lands have been confiscated, and even the vestments and chalices of the altar have been put up for sale. In this way the Italian parliament, pushed for means to vote its ever-swelling budget, has spoiled the Church, and driven out penniless upon the streets, not merely religious men, but thousands of peaceful nuns. And, simultaneously with the inauguration of this barbarity, practiced upon those whose lives were devoted to prayer and deeds of mercy, the invaders introduced into the city of Rome the reign of blasphemy and public obscenity.

From the taking of Rome, notwithstanding the colossal spoliations, the deficit in the public treasury went on increasing until, in 1872, the public debt had passed the sum of 1700 million dollars. Since 1872, in spite of an incredible outlay continually augmented, there have been years when the revenue has been made to come near to the expenditure; and thus the debt has not in-

¹ Our computations throughout are made on the basis of 5 *lire* to the dollar. 5 *lire* are really equivalent to only 95 cents; but we have neglected the fractions of millions, and this gives us a very fair approximation in round numbers.

creased each year in the same proportion. How is it that when the expenditure has been multiplied fabulously year by year, the debt has not always increased in the same proportions? What new source of revenue has sprung up since the taking of Rome? No new source. Not one new source of true revenue has been found or developed since the taking of Rome. The yearly deficit has simply been cancelled in a more gorgeous style by the theft of private property. The government just condemned your property, sold it at auction, pocketed the money and gave you bonds which will soon be worthless. This was the way in which you made a loan to the government. We remember how, about a dozen years ago, the famous missionary College of the Propaganda was forced to sell its real estate and accept for the proceeds some government bonds of half value. This same method of securing a revenue was shortly after about to be applied to the American College at Rome, the property of citizens of the United States. President Arthur, of happy memory, regarded the theft as a little too royal for endurance. He sent word to plundering Italy to keep its hands off. It is not necessary to add that his order was obeyed. In this and other kindred ways the treasury has been supplied, and the government has been able to credit itself with an actual peace army of 800,000, and a war footing of over 3,000,000 soldiers; and this, too, in a population of 30,000,000 on a territory about three times as large as Ohio, and at an expense for military equipment and maintenance of from \$85,000,000 to \$100,000,000 a year, or from \$250,000 to \$300,000 a day.

Now, the annual interest to be paid upon the public debt has been stated to be \$153,000,000. Sometimes it is not easy to sell stolen real estate, so expedients have to be devised to secure the ready money, and taxation is a ready expedient. The supply must be made to equal the demand. Hence it is that taxation may eat up half an income even when profits are fair. House tax has been as high as 49 per centum of the assessed rent. A son is taxed on becoming heir to his father's possessions. It requires a large income to be able to pay all the various taxes and still to live. If the income decreases, the taxes have often to be paid by retrenching on the necessities of life, and from this grinding taxation there has resulted the greatest distress, especially to the rural districts.

In 1890 there were, according to the official reports, 4774 communes where meat was used only by families in good circumstances, and such families were few. Throughout 3638 entire communes, beef never went to the table. Even in fertile Lombardy and Aemilia thousands have been carried off by a disease that is due, in great part, to scanty and unwholesome food. Still,

in the northern provinces the burdensome taxes upon real estate have been generally paid, even at these sacrifices. And why have the taxes been generally paid thus far, at such sacrifices, in the northern provinces? The story of the less rich southern provinces will answer. It is a question of payment or confiscation. In the one province of Naples, even previous to 1883, 40,000 small holdings had been confiscated because the owners could not pay the taxes. In 1887, according to M. Gallenga (no friend to the papal sovereignty), the 40,000 had grown to 65,000. Of these 65,000 estates which were either seized by the officials or even abandoned before the inevitable seizure—out of these 65,000 there were 25,000 estates that could not find a purchaser at governmental auction. Senator Jacini, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, said, as early as 1880, that if they wanted to get more money out of the farmer, they would have to tax him on fresh air.

The ruin of the land-owners has entailed, of course, the idleness and dispersion of the land laborers. These are the men who are coming to America to render still more complicated our labor and emigration problem.

But the same difficulty besets the shopkeeper. The shopkeeper has had to pay an income tax of more than 30 per centum on all incomes exceeding \$100. To understand the situation, take the illustration of a man with a small business and a small home. The income from his business is, we shall say, \$1200. Suppose that out of this he pays the government $30\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. as an income tax, or an income tax of \$365. This would leave him \$835. Suppose that his little home would rent for \$240 a year, and that he has to pay 38 per cent. of this assessed rent, or \$90 a year, to the government. This would leave him \$745, after the two taxes, out of his income of \$1200. Out of this \$745, or \$14.50 a week, he has to pay gas bills, doctor's bills, to buy food and clothing and fuel for himself, his wife and two or three children, and to keep his house in repair. How much can this shopkeeper lay by? Nothing. If business is slack for a year or two, what has he to fall back on? Nothing. If the profits of his business fall from \$1200 to \$700, the government still seizes over \$300 for income and house tax alone, and he has only the remainder, between \$7 and \$8 a week, for all the expenses of himself, his wife and children. So when he finds himself exposed to or even reduced to the extremity of having to pay his taxes out of his little capital, he, too, gathers together his family and emigrates to America. Even when all the members of a family live together, all working and combining their wages, the taxes alone take about one-fourth of their earnings. The year's living, in strictest economy, takes

all the rest, and sometimes more. The taxes in Florence are said to be six times what they were twenty years ago. The taxes have been increased universally to the utmost limit, and, as we have seen lately, they do not suffice to pay the interest on the public debt. In 1881 the local taxation was \$121,000,000, and in 1891 it was more than \$150,000,000.

Some idea of the tariff methods may be formed from the duties levied upon a few articles of general use. The tax on sugar is equal to the value of the sugar. The tax on coffee is twice the value of the coffee. The tax on coal-oil is three times the value of the oil. The tax on spirits is five times the value of the spirits. So that for a pound of sugar the people pay the worth of two pounds; for a pound of coffee, the worth of three pounds; for a gallon of oil, the worth of four gallons, and for a gallon of spirits, the worth of six gallons. Salt is made in Italy, but the people have to pay for it forty times the cost of production, thus paying three or four times the price that is paid even in countries where no salt is produced. A story is told of a father of a family at Naples who was summoned before the court, and charged with having taken five pails of water out of the bay. He pleaded that he wanted the water as a bath for his sick children. He was dismissed with a reprimand and a fine to the value of the salt contained in the five buckets of water from the Mediterranean; for salt is a government monopoly. The price of salt was for a long time thirty-five times the cost of production; now it is forty times. This means that the consumer pays four dollars for a bag of salt which has been made at an outlay of ten cents. The Italian government, keen in its economic perceptions, learned early that salt is necessary to the human system, and concluded that hence it might put its own price upon the commodity. But as the tax increased, the consumption decreased, because the people, growing poorer and poorer, were unable to pay the exorbitant price. In 1882 the amount of salt consumed was 22 pounds per head; in 1892 it was 14 pounds per head. The raising of the price up to forty times the cost of production was intended to remedy the matter—on the government side. A man living on the seashore is allowed to draw one pail of water a day from the deep. Thus is the government monopoly guarded that the poor man, with the ocean rolling at his feet, may not escape paying high tariff on his pinch of salt.

In 1869—that is, just before the occupation of Rome and the establishment of “Italy”—there were, it is said, about 70,000 Italians, all told, in the United States. At present we think it nothing to receive that many in a year. In 1869 the total emigration from Italy was 23,000. In 1876 it rose only to 29,000.

In 1879 it leaped up to 119,821. In 1887 153,000 Italians emigrated to America alone. In 1888 the number of emigrants that left from the single port of Genoa alone was 181,000, and the total emigration in the same year was 290,736, a figure which put Italy, in this respect, ahead of all the continental nations.

The condition of wretchedness to which the people have been reduced has sometimes been spoken of openly in parliament.

Deputy Romano (speech of December 12, 1885) described the state of Italy as being even then one of "general distress and misery, with the exception of a few colossal old fortunes, and some new ones, the fruit of public wrong." He said there was "a general struggle for existence by one class of society, which detests the other, believing it to be the cause of its misfortunes, though the true cause is bad government." They were suffering, he said, "all the consequences of ill-advising hunger, deterioration of character, immorality, the mania of place-hunting, the emigration of those who do not wish to be obliged to choose between a wretched occupation and crime, smuggling, usury, crimes and suicides, and an unnecessary discontent that is undermining our constitutions and the tranquillity of the state." (Translation of Rt. Rev. John O'Connor, D.D., in the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*, April, 1886.)

The Italian public debt was :

In 1861, \$600,000,000.

In 1872, \$1,700,000,000.

In 1876, \$1,800,000,000.

In 1890, \$2,500,000,000.

This is exclusive of a communal debt of \$250,000,000. Thus has the debt grown in time of peace and in those early days when a nation is supposed to be practicing the economy so necessary to ensure its existence. The tax necessary to pay the interest on the debt, over and above the tax required to meet the fabulous running expenses, is \$4.50 per head of the total population of 30,000,000 people, whilst in England it is \$3.75 ; in Austria, \$3.00 ; in Prussia, \$2.50, and in Russia, \$1.50. The amount of revenue spent since 1872 is something like \$5,300,000,000, and the expenditure of the past ten years shows an increase of 30 per cent., as compared with that of the ten years preceding. But the revenue has been steadily decreasing. The sources of plunder have been exhausted one by one, and the natural sources of revenue, when dried at the fountain, cannot be expected to be perennial or to replenish themselves. The revenue was :

In 1889-90, \$380,000,000.

In 1890-91, \$379,000,000.

In 1891-92, \$355,000,000.

In 1892-93, \$333,000,000.

The deficit for many years back gives an average of \$8,000,000 per annum. In October, 1893, Signor Giolitti, who was then Minister of Finance, stated that he needed only \$2,800,000 to cover the deficit of that year. But in February, 1894, Signor Sonnino confessed to the Chamber that he had a deficit of about \$7,000,000, and that there existed a floating debt of \$100,000,000, made up solely from the accumulation of the yearly deficits. Sonnino was bold in presenting a remedy for the deficit of the year. His proposition was that those who held 5 per cent. bonds were to be asked to freely accept 4 per cent., and that if they would not accept this freely, they were to have an income tax of 20 per cent., or one-fifth, levied on their interest. Thus they would have a choice between a free and a constrained donation of six out of the seven millions which he needed for the moment. This is merry financiering. An open parliamentary proposition thus to repudiate the interest on the public debt is only the "tuning up" for a great orchestral movement that is coming. Added to this, the coinage of Italy, as compared with our own, may help us to some understanding. In the year 1892 the total Italian coinage of both gold and silver was \$153,002, whilst the coinage of gold alone in the United States was more than \$34,250,000. And yet, somehow, we are complaining of a scarcity of money.

The strain on the banks began to be felt as very pressing nearly six years ago, and it does not require much foresight to see that the late gigantic bank failures are only a shadow of what is to come. Perhaps the terrible straits to which the government is reduced may be imagined from the statement which went the rounds of the press in January, 1894. Twenty million lire, that is, something less than four million dollars, were needed recently to pay an urgent debt. The government applied to the Italian bankers, but these either could not or would not advance the money to the national treasury. Not knowing what to do, Humbert appealed to the German government, and obtained the loan only after threatening to break away from the Triple Alliance if the money was not forthcoming. This money was to pay the interest on the debt, to meet the accruing coupons. It could not be had in Italy. It could be obtained in Germany only, and then only under threat, for Germany may soon need that Italian army, which is costing the Italian people three hundred thousand dollars a day. This borrowing to pay the interest is the first scene in the last act. How long will Germany hand over the money? Or how soon may a war be precipitated to cast all the fortunes of Europe into the pot?

Italy pays yearly to foreigners not less than \$50,000,000 in gold,

as interest. The balance of trade is against Italy by from \$50,000,000 to \$85,000,000 a year. This, however, is counteracted by the money which tourists spend in the country; Americans leaving in Italy about \$35,000,000, and the English, French and Germans together, about \$70,000,000 yearly.

In addition to the bankruptcy just spoken of, a crevice was opened at the same time in the vaults of the national treasury, through which keen brokers were drawing from the government a ten per cent. premium on the total issue of silver, without making any loan whatsoever to the State. And this ten per cent. they were able to draw as often as once or twice a week. This may seem strange, but to understand the case, remember that Italian money is in gold, silver, paper and copper. This, of course, is nothing extraordinary. But Italy, being in the Latin Monetary Union, is bound by the articles of the Union to coin only a limited amount of silver; and thus the silver of each State passes, on the bi-metallic standard, for gold, in each State of the Union. Now, on account of the condition of Italian finances, the government paper (the smallest note being five lire, or ninety-five cents), is at a discount of ten per cent. as compared with gold; whilst, on account of the less inherent value of the silver token money, the paper remains at par as compared with silver. Suppose, then, that you have a hundred dollars in paper; you can exchange it for a hundred dollars in silver. This silver you can send to France, or to some other State in the Latin Monetary Union, and there you exchange it for a hundred dollars in gold. The gold you bring back to Italy and exchange it for Italian paper, receiving readily 110 in paper for your 100 in gold. Thus your paper 100 of yesterday or of last week has become 110. Repeat the operation ten times, and, without compounding, you have doubled your capital. This is really what took place. All the silver was swept away; and where it was replaced, the substitute was gold at a premium of ten per cent., or paper at a discount of ten per cent. The effect of this upon the entire retail trade was disastrous. In the summer of 1893, and up to the middle of the autumn there was left for change only paper and copper. But the smallest note in paper was for five lire, or ninety-five cents. Besides this, there was nothing but the copper cent and the fifth of a cent. But as it was never contemplated to make the copper token-coin the largest and the only change under a dollar, the copper coinage has, of course, been very limited, and cannot be increased on account of the comparative worthlessness of copper. It is not hard to understand the paralysis with which entire retail trade was stricken. Change had to be made to a purchaser with heavy rolls of copper, with postage stamps, and even with small articles of everyday use,

such as matches. When even this could not be done, there remained a choice between no sale or credit. The railways, which are government monopolies, made no change to ticket buyers at the stations; and if a traveller had not the pennies to pay for his baggage, he had either to leave it behind him, or to give up his journey. During the month of October (1893), the government began the issue of paper notes of the value of one lire (19 cents), which it declared legal tender, to meet the requirements of the people for small change; and set about gathering in the silver for itself to help pay its foreign indebtedness. It may be remarked that the debt of the Italian government is held chiefly by foreigners. Four-fifths of the interest is paid to foreigners, mainly to the French. War, therefore, with France, in the hope of repudiation, would not be an unwelcome thing to the responsible parties who would, of course, be safe from the bullets. But there are breaches too many and too wide to be plastered over with paper; and we may well pity the poor people whose fortune will lie in some pounds of paper issued by a government already in a state of bankruptcy. Still, for the present needs they are constrained to put up with the deceit.

The business failures in 1879 were 700; in 1883 they were 725; in 1888-89 they were 4400. Insolvent establishments have been closing up faster than the courts can attend to them. Out of 5,000,000 proprietors of the soil, 4,000,000 are small proprietors; and these, oppressed by the heaviest taxation in all Europe, are mortgaging their lands away. The mortgages of real property were:

In 1876, \$1,318,000,000.

In 1886, \$1,551,000,000.

In 1890, \$1,644,000,000.

That is to say, from 1876 to 1890 the mortgages increased by \$300,000,000, notwithstanding that in the same time, as we have seen, so many emigrated, and so many others simply deserted their lands. In the meantime, whilst the backbone of the nation was being thus broken, the war budget grew from \$43,000,000 in 1879, to \$113,000,000 in 1889. With the land out of cultivation production has, of course, diminished; exports have fallen away; bank deposits have diminished; and the imports, too, have fallen away—the money is not there to pay for them.

Once, when King Humbert complained to Sindaco Mercatelli of the flood of emigrants pouring out of the country, Mercatelli replied that it was simply a case of *emigration* or *starvation*, and when the king asked him why he did not try to supply the lack of agriculture by the promotion of manufactures, Mercatelli answered, "We have no capital." And when the king urged further, that

2,000,000 lire (\$400,000) would be sufficient to start some kind of manufactures, the city treasurer (it was at Ravenna, before the present crisis), broke in, "Perhaps Your Majesty would find us 2,000,000 lire." At this, it is said, the king looked serious. And then Crispi, when called upon to give his attention to the matter, goes off and writes letters, stating that he has been studying the situation, and that the solution of the problem will be the glory of Humbert's reign!!! We have before us, now, the solution and the glory.

About the vandalism of the Italian government, I shall say but a word. It would form the subject of a long and annoying discourse. Suffice it to state that the government has renewed the work of the barbarians, defacing or tearing down the ancient ruins and architectural wonders that formed the study of the visiting world and linked our age steam with the patience and magnificence of the past. "Ouida," writing in the "*North American Review*" (Oct., 1888), says: "All over the land destruction of the vilest and most vulgar kind is at work: destruction before which the more excusable and more virile destruction of war looks almost noble. For, the present destruction has no other motive, object, or mainspring, than the lowest greed." To such an extent was this carried on that, as we remember, a few years ago the German archæologists made an appeal to the world, and the artists and scholars of Europe called upon the Sardinian Government to give over its vandalism. Everybody knows Da Vinci's masterpiece, *The Last Supper*. Da Vinci lived in an age of great painters. He excelled all the painters of his day. "*The Last Supper*," is his greatest work, and we may say, the greatest work that has ever been produced. He painted it upon the wall of the refectory in the Convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie, at Milan. This painting is styled, simply, the highest effort of Christian art. The Italian government turned that refectory into a stable and left the marvellous work of art to the horses. A move was even made to destroy the wondrous relic, the mausoleum of Hadrian, the castle of San Angelo, for the purpose of widening a street.

The one person who has made himself signally notorious during the short life of the Kingdom of Italy, is Signor Crispi, who held the office of prime minister for about four years, and who was forced to retire in January, 1891. In 1864 Crispi was a member of the Piedmontese parliament, the parliament of Victor Emmanuel, at Florence. In one of his parliamentary speeches of that year we read the following words: "The Roman Pontiff cannot become a citizen of a great state. He must be a prince second to no one." In six years Crispi had become the open enemy of Pope and King, for, in 1870 we find him one of that notorious committee which

put to the Piedmontese Ministry this ultimatum: "Order the troops to march upon Rome, or we shall proclaim the republic and the downfall of the monarchy." Crispi had become the tool of the advanced revolutionists; and, by a strange paradox of history, as we have seen, these Italian Jacobins were the tools of Bismarckian despotism. Prussia allowed them to satisfy their hatred of religion by thus forcing Victor Emmanuel on to Rome under threat of his crown, in order that through them Victor Emmanuel might be kept from an alliance with Napoleon III. with whom Prussia was just then at war.

Crispi, as an agent of the revolution, has been more daring than his predecessors, the prime ministers, Cavour, D'Azeglio and Depretis. He has been no lover of the illegitimate government he has made a show of serving. And though he has been busy attacking the Pope, it is not that he has hated the monarchy less but, that with the heart of the renegade, he hates the Church more. He knew from the beginning that the greatest obstacle to the destruction of the civil order was the existence of the Church. I quote from the *Riforma*, his organ: "In Italy, among the master-masons we count the illustrious head of the government. His late conduct has been rigorously in keeping with masonic principles." What these principles are in Italy we learn from a circular issued by the Grand Orient of Italy towards the end of 1886. This circular declares that "the suppression of religious orders, the confiscation of ecclesiastical goods and the destruction of the temporal power, form the granite base upon which Masonry must rise." D'Azeglio had said long ago, at Turin, that for them, the Roman Question was a question of hate. The leaders of the Italian Parliament with Crispi at their head were enemies of the monarchy, but the Church stood in the way of their socialistic schemes. And the mere fact of Crispi being imposed upon Humbert, as his prime minister, by the party of the revolution, was, in itself, without any exposition, to those who knew the circumstances, clear evidence of the short lease of life that remained to the kingdom of Italy.

On the one hand, with the military of Italy under the command of Bismarck, Crispi, who was a cringing creature of Bismarck, saw that it was impossible to carry out his radical ideas in the social order. The revolution, nevertheless, emboldened by the advancement of Crispi, began to display itself. Hostile socialistic demonstrations were made from one end of the peninsula to the other. Even the students of the dechristianized university set on foot a riot, when the king and queen went to open the exposition at Bologna. On the other hand, Crispi heard millions raising their voices in the shattered state of society for a restoration of the

Papal States. To counteract the influence of these he had passed the code of penal laws which are fresh in our memories and which went into effect the first day of January, 1890, laws so brutal and draconian that we marvel at their being proposed in the nineteenth century in the midst of a civilized people. The long continued and ever growing protests of eighteen years against the desecrations and spoliations of the usurping government; moreover, the magnificent proclamation of Leo's sovereignty made by the world irrespective of creed at the time of the Papal jubilee, all this had driven the terror-stricken revolutionary parliament to the passage of a penal code such as England never applied to Ireland in Ireland's darkest days. It came from that party that blazons liberty and equality on its banners, but which has never been known to allow even liberty of speech to any adversary whom it could crush by main force. According to this new code, any minister of religion who will dare to criticise the rascality of the highway robbery that is going on and has been going on under the name of law, can be fined six hundred dollars and be sent to prison for three years. This is by clause 104 which reads: "Any minister of religion who, abusing the moral power he possesses by reason of his office, bringing into contempt the laws and institutions of his country or the acts of the authorities, is punishable with imprisonment from six months to three years and a fine of from five hundred to three thousand lire." This is gag law. The mere mention of these institutions and laws is necessarily to hold them up to contempt. Again, for any bishop or priest who advocates, even in private conversation, the restoration of any part of the Papal States, clause 101 decrees penal servitude for life—a punishment that is rarely visited upon the most desperate assassins taken with their hands red in the blood of their victims. Cardinal Manning, speaking of clause 104, said: "Had this law been in operation here, I should have incurred I know not what penalty of imprisonment and I know not what fine."¹ The London *Saturday Review* says, "There can be no question that these new laws are tyrannical in principle." The anti-papal London *Times* remarks, "The Church, from the Pope down to the lowest ecclesiastic, is in the hands of the State without defence from the action of the law." (From its own Roman correspondent). The London *Spectator* says, "These laws are as bad as any of our own penal laws." The code passed, though some of the senators hostile to the Papacy argued that it boded no good to the government to be showing so much mildness to criminals, and so much severity to those who habitually preached order and morality.

¹ Discourse at St. Mary's, Moorfields, July 7, 1888.

It may be asked; why do not the people resist? Are the people depraved, as a whole? No. The greater part of them are practical catholics—seventy per centum in a population of thirty million. Why do they not resist at the polls as the people did in Belgium? In examining these questions, we find five chief obstacles to a favorable reply, obstacles which are sufficient answer, without going into the difficulties in the way of an unarmed, undrilled majority endeavoring to shake off a military despotism.

1. The Pope has forbidden participation in the general or state elections, because this would be a recognition of the unlawful government.

2. The overthrow of the military despotism by a civil election would be provided against by the government, which would set moving its whole army of officials, civil and military, to secure itself by fraud, force and intimidation. It would keep its power by the same means by which it came into power.

3. A conscientious man, if elected to parliament, could not take the oath of office. Thus it would be impossible for conscientious men, coming in one by one, to obtain a majority.

4. Even if, by some improbable means, conscientious men should obtain a majority in the Chamber, or House of Representatives, there still remains the Senate which with the royal prerogative of senatorial appointment can be colored at will.

5. And even beyond this there is the unlimited veto power of the King.

In municipal or city elections conscientious men are sometimes returned; but their power does not extend beyond the municipality. Indeed, out of thirty million people, there are not more than eight million adherents of the government. The title, "Kingdom of Italy," is to-day as it has been from the beginning only another name for a military occupation. You may ask how such a state of things can be allowed to exist, and why the people do not rise up and put an end to it. We will ask you in return how it is that four or five boys can board a railway train and plunder it, even whilst that train is under the protection of the United States government which has the support of sixty-five million people? Or how can it come to pass that a great metropolis may sometimes be ruled by a body of men whom the really representative men of the community will not so much as recognize in social life?

But how was it that for twenty-three years we were not given the whole truth about the condition of Italy, in that foreign news column which marks the wonderful energy of our daily American press? The reason is simply this, that the whole truth was not transmitted. And why was it not transmitted? Because the

conduits through which the Italian news had to filter before reaching the cable were and have been as they are occupied by parties hostile to the Papacy. And so the world has been hoodwinked with cable-dispatches about the large army and big ships, and the appointment of Cardinals, and the health of the Pope. Letters arriving from time to time and giving the true situation were rarely printed in the daily press and hence did not reach the people at large. Hence our journalism, phenomenal for its enterprise, has been at least negatively instrumental in rendering still more phenomenal the misinformation of the American people concerning Italy and the Pope. But within the last two years there occurred two events which fixed the attention of the world—though it were only for the moment—upon the cruelty, self-seeking and depravity of the powers that rule in Italy. We refer to the bank scandal and to the Sicilian revolt. Any one accustomed to keep his eye upon the “cable” could see that both events were dismissed with the greatest possible dispatch. Yet they were so public and they so affected public official action that they could not be veiled from the world by a web of stories woven out of consistories and the possibilities of Leo’s successor. On the 1st day of December, 1893, the Italian Parliament was the scene of indescribable confusion. There was hissing and cursing and a call for the fire brand. Sometime previously the depositors of the Bank of Rome had discovered that the bank had been despoiled. An investigation had been demanded and the government had resisted the investigation, parliamentary investigation, though there was unequivocal accusation of actual and past Cabinet Ministers being implicated in the embezzlements of Rome, Palermo and Naples. The clamor had to be quieted by allowing the investigation to be made and the sealed report of Committee was handed to the President of the Chamber on the 1st of December, 1893. The report implicated the Prime Minister, some members of the Cabinet and most of the leading men in Parliament. Even the royal family did not escape unsinged. The money, it seems, was used to buy votes. That was all. We can imagine how the Chamber went wild with excitement when it heard the Commission report complicity on the part of ministers and ex-ministers of state.

It is not necessary for us to rehearse here the story of Sicily. The late rioting and bloodshed consequent upon the misery of the people are fresh in our memories. But it is well for us to remember how at the time the Italian journals acknowledged that there were many other provinces of Italy where the people were just as miserable, and declared that Sicily and Naples had been liberated from one tyrant (Bourbon) only to be put at the mercy

of a hundred thousand. The brutal government had to contend not with men alone. It was said at the time that as many as 800 Sicilian women were imprisoned in a week. A writer in the *Fortnightly Review* (April, 1894), speaking of Sicily, says: "Military tribunals judge civil offences, or what are considered offences, and pass sentence of imprisonment, varying in duration from six months to thirty years. The infamous sentence of twenty-three years' imprisonment, of which three are to be passed in solitary confinement, passed on the young advocate Molinari, for what is really no more than offence of opinions, has forced a cry of surprise and disgust even from the German press. Hundreds of brutal sentences have been passed for which there is no hope or chance of appeal, and vast numbers of men in the flower of youth or in the prime of manhood are being flung into the hell of Italian prisons, there to be left to rot away in unseen and unpitied suffering till death releases them or insanity seizes them."

The example of official public robbery given by the government has, of course, been followed by those who choose to ply the trade upon a smaller scale. Hence, both Sicily and the Peninsula are infested with brigands. Brigands hover about the very gates of Rome. The story of the brigands is a long one, and we cannot find place for it here. It may be dismissed, therefore, with the following statement, made last autumn by the correspondent of the *Liverpool Catholic Times*: "The public sustain and protect brigands in the neighborhood of Viterbo and all over Sicily. Many proprietors pay a regular sum to certain powerful chiefs, who, in return, protect their property and person, and, moreover, prevent any other brigands from attacking them. We can assert as a positive fact that some powerful princes of the Roman aristocracy pay as much as 4000 and 5000 lire a year in order to secure this protection of their lives and property; and during the few months they pass in their country possessions, their children, and, indeed, all members of the family, are constantly kept in view, even during a short walk, by a protector chosen, no doubt, from a band of brigands."

As many as eight years ago, Prime Minister Depretis, reviewing the condition of the country, sounded the alarm to the government. Depretis went out and Crispi came in. Crispi only intensified the situation. The *Tribuna* newspaper of Rome, began to speak openly of bankruptcy and general anarchy. It stated (February 7 and 8, 1889) that the workmen were using language such as this: "We will not have alms. If we cannot get work, we shall turn our thoughts to petroleum or dynamite." And the *Nazione* announced (January 28, 1889) that famine had become the "vital question for Italy," and that no other question was so

urgent. The *Tribuna*, too, began to speak of famine as the "supreme question, the truly urgent question, upon whose solution depends the solution of all the others." At the opening of the year 1889 the same *Tribuna* (government newspaper) put the case thus tersely: "Now we are in chaos, or rather we are about to enter it." Twelve months went by, and on the last day of January, 1891, Crispi, after a blustering speech in the chamber, and challenging a vote upon his new tax bill as the test of his popularity, was defeated by a vote of 186 to 123. His resignation of the premiership soon followed the defeat. The king found it difficult to secure an incumbent for the vacant office. The Marchese di Rudini at length accepted, but he resigned as soon as he found out what he had done. Then came Signor Giolitti, but he too retired before the coming hurricane. So Crispi had to step into power again to celebrate the silver jubilee. Let us call to mind what he said after the affair of Ravenna, that the solution of the problem would be the glory of Humbert's reign. It is time to read over again that letter of Mazzini, which lies in the Brera Library of Milan, and in which the old conspirator, Balaam-like, announces that "Crispi will be the last minister of the monarchy."

The people are growing tired, very tired of it all. Some years ago when Sardinia—of which Humbert is really king—was a prey to famine and the people were making bread out of acorns, the Sardinian representatives in the parliament threatened to resign rather than be party to a government that was treating its subjects to death by starvation. At the same time the President of the Council at Genoa said on taking his seat: "The monarchy has had its chance. . . . The sooner it disappears the better. If it will not do so in a courtly way, it will be taught another method." This voice is echoed all over the land, and the new mayors of the cities have been refusing to take the oath of office. The voters, too, few as they are, are becoming very indifferent. At the Roman election when Signor Bonghi was defeated in the beginning of last year, out of 6890 electors, 5032 stayed away from the polls. Germany is disgusted. Last September the *Reichsbote*, which was looked upon as the organ of Chancellor Caprivi, used some very strong language, looking at things from the point of view of one who might soon have need of that great Italian army. It spoke in tones of rebuke about the robbery of the arsenals that has been going on for years, loads of rifles being carted across the border or scattered through Italy as sporting guns. It said that such a thing could never happen to the Royal Arsenals if the administration were not in for some of the plunder; and it hinted significantly that no one could place any reliance upon an ally that had no faith in itself.

As we are telling a tale of robberies it will not do to omit the huge theft committed five years ago and which was so dastardly as to call forth a storm of indignation from the Turkish press. It was nothing less than the confiscation of a sum of money estimated at \$400,000,000, "accumulated," to use the words of the *New York Times'* correspondent, "in the course of centuries from every city of the peninsula, by generous and charitable donors and testators." There was a revenue of about thirty millions a year from these charitable bequests; so the government took the management into its own hands regardless of the will of the donors. It was clear at the time that there was little left to steal by law. The debate upon the subject in the House of Deputies was carried on in an illegal manner. Most of the time there was not a quorum in the house—only from 80 to 100 members being present out of a roll call of 508. Finally 295 members were gathered in; and a secret ballot was taken with black and white balls so that no one should know how another had voted. The result of this confiscation was to stop all charitable bequests during the death-struggle of the present kingdom of Italy. If, this morning, we had read in the dispatches from Washington that the national legislature had confiscated all the charitable bequests left, during our one century of existence, to hospitals, asylums, infirmaries, refuges, homes for the friendless, as a perpetual dowry to the widow, the orphan, the waif, the foundling, the homeless sick and the unsheltered poor, what would we have thought of it? But we have said enough. Volumes would not contain the history of Italy's sacrilegious thefts. Pretexts were never wanting. When the *Riforma* was agitating the suppression of the convents and academies where young ladies were receiving a Christian education, it put forward as a plea that religion could not be eradicated so long as the women sided with the Pope.

To summarize, therefore, Italy is ready to celebrate her silver jubilee. But where is the silver? In twenty-five years Italy has wished to rival England and France and Germany and Russia, nations whose present strength is the accumulated vigor of ages. It is held together by bands of iron and not by the homogeneity of its own mass. Its government is neither by the people nor of the people nor for the people. It has put on those appurtenances of a great power, which in all great powers have always grown naturally, like an outer integument, around the heart and core of the nation, from the substantial development of the seed. Italy has put on the raiment of a great nation, but cannot pay its furnishings. The pride of being clad in the raiment of a great nation has made Italy thief so steadily and so enormously at the very root of supplies, that the root itself is withered and the fruit ceased

long ago. So Italy must fight with somebody to pay for her soldier clothes or else cut herself down to the figure of Greece and Portugal. There is no hope for a revival on the present status. The possibility of a tax expedient is past. The tax limit has been reached. Any increase will be followed by a diminution in consumption which will at once defeat the purpose of the tax. Men are living now in the greatest economy. There are a hundred applicants for every vacant place. Men reared in wealth and comfort, doctors in the law and in medicine and in engineering, are glad to act as copyists for a few dollars a month. The middle classes have been swept away. There are vast fortunes in the hands of a few; and misery and wretchedness in the homes of the millions. The lands are lying idle; and an industrious population is starving; and the workmen in the cities are demanding the bread that has not been put as seed into the soil. Before the invasion it used to be said at Rome that no one could die there of starvation or be sick and be uncared for; so many and so well regulated were the hospitals and houses of charity. But the revenues of these establishments have been seized and squandered; and we have seen the revengeful, hungry crowds surging through the streets of Rome, doing deeds of violence and clamoring for bread.

Even in the official report of 1883 the reporting officer said: "From 1870 to this day we have not made one step forward. The lasting political co-existence of a Pope and a King at Rome is to-day less probable than it was eleven years ago, especially since so great a lapse of time without results only places in relief the intrinsic difficulties of a favorable solution." That was just it. The difficulty was intrinsic, that is, essential, and hence insurmountable; and time has only placed it in greater relief.

When Rome was made the capital of Italy, the intention of the Piedmontese was to reduce the Papal influence at Rome. Florence would have served as a capital; and Naples would have made a far better one than Rome. But they were blind with hate and would not see what a writer in the *Dublin Review* (July, 1877), has well expressed: "It shows outwardly what it is inwardly, and no more reminds one of a secular capital than Jerusalem can have reminded one of Athens. It is not a fortified place, nor a commercial emporium, nor a city of pleasure; and its treasures of art are less visible than its treasures of religion. It is not an antiquity dating from the middle ages, nor a manufacturing metropolis of the nineteenth century. It is simply the Eternal City. To dream of converting it into something new and brilliant,—an Italian Paris, or perhaps an Italian Berlin—is to forget that spirit defies matter, and that traditions cannot die unless the spots over which they brood be sown with salt and made desolate."

"Thou shalt sound the trumpet and shalt proclaim remission to all the inhabitants of thy land: for it is the year of jubilee. . . . Every man shall return to his possession, because it is the jubilee because of the sanctification of the jubilee and you are strangers" (Leviticus, xxv.)

WILLIAM POLAND, S. J.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

A BENEDICTINE RESTORATION.

IN the spring of 1831 the French newspapers announced that the old Priory of Solèsmes, near Sablé (Sarthe), was for sale. Few of the readers who saw the announcement knew what a history was contained in that simple word Solèsmes; fewer still could see in the simple fact of its changing owners that its history was about to repeat itself.

The foundation of this ancient priory dated from 1010, an epoch when the Benedictine Order in France was at the apogee of its splendor. It was in what have been called the ages of faith; that is, when the light of faith and halo of sanctity shed a brilliant lustre which relieved the darkness and semi-barbarism of feudalism. Its founder was a pious feudal lord, Geoffroy I. of Sablé, called Geoffroy the Elder, who had already been very liberal to the Church and churchmen, and who bought the hill upon which the priory was built from his brother, Raoul de Beaumont, Vicomte du Maine. It was at the close of his life he conceived the idea of making this foundation "for the redemption of his soul and those of his parents." At this time, the service man owes to God was the first preoccupation of fervent Christians who, if possessed of the world's wealth, would not die in peace unless they had devoted some portion of it to the erection of a church, a chauntry or a monastery. In the eleventh century, and long after, they were more given to founding monasteries than secular churches. At this epoch the rule of St. Benedict was regarded as the most perfect model of the cloistral life in all western Europe, and the monks to whom Geoffroy confided his foundation were Benedictines.

A century before, Bernon had founded in Burgundy the famous abbey of Cluny (910), which, under St. Odo and his successors,

had become the centre of an immense movement of renovation in the Church and among the people. St. Benedict had thus achieved a second victory over barbarism, still more decisive and more glorious than the first. Among the numerous monasteries of the Province of Maine which had risen from their ruins and flourished during this happy epoch of resurrection that of Saint Pierre de la Canture, established in the city of Le Mans by the bishop, St. Bertrand, in the seventh century, must be placed in the front rank. Geoffroy de Sablé wished that his new foundation should be subject to this great abbey, with the simple title of Priory, and placed, like the mother house, under the patronage of the Apostle St. Peter.¹

The Church of the Priory of Solèsmes was dedicated, with imposing ceremony, by Avesgand, Bishop of Le Mans, in presence of Hubert, Bishop of Angers, and the Abbots of Canture and St. Vincent, Ingelband and Reynauld. Hugues I., Count of Maine, first confirmed the charter of foundation with the sign of the cross, and then Geoffroy de Sablé, Adelaide, his wife, Drogon, his son, and Raoul, his brother, the bishops and abbots appended their signatures. At the head of the monks who were to form the first community was placed Rambeul, the first Prior of Solèsmes. The founder, who endowed the priory with extensive lands, died soon after, and was interred in the church, as, subsequently, were his wife and sons, although all traces of their place of sepulture have disappeared. The monks, however, have not allowed his memory to disappear, and every year, on the anniversary of the dedication of the church, the charter of foundation is read in the refectory, to revive the recollection of his good deeds; and although the Revolution has swept away the patrimony he donated to the monastery, the Holy Sacrifice is offered for his soul, as if the monks still possessed it.

"The history of the Priory of Solèsmes is neither long nor varied. Situated in the country, and placed, from its foundation, under the dependency of a rich and powerful abbey, it never had any existence apart, and could not, for that reason, acquire great renown. For eight centuries this peaceful dwelling was open to the friends of solitude and prayer. Unknown to the world, and very often misunderstood, pure virtues shone in its enclosure, and if human weakness was sometimes displayed there, what house, built by men, after so many centuries, ever presented annals wholly exempt from those stains which God alone has a right to remark, since He alone is holy?" Thus, summed up in a few lines traced by a master hand,² is the whole history of the monastery.

¹ *Solèsmes et Dom Guéranger.* Par le R. P. Dom Alphonse Guepin.

² Guéranger: *Essai historique sur l'Abbaye de Solèsmes.*

During the second half of the eleventh century Maine became debatable ground, possession of which was competed for by the Dukes of Normandy, Counts of Anjou and others. To ensure their liberty, the monks sought to have their domains guaranteed to them by each of these rivals. In 1073 the monks of Canture submitted the charter of Solèsmes to William the Conqueror for his ratification. A little later—and, doubtless, unknown to the English monarch, the monks obtained the same favor from Geoffrey III. and Foulques, his brother—both rival claimants for the county of Anjou. At the same time the charter was confirmed by two sons of the founder.

After the death of William the Conqueror the struggle for supremacy in Maine was continued by his son Robert and Count Hugues, the latter having gained the upper hand in the capital of the province. Bishop Höel, who had espoused the cause of the Norman party, fled from his episcopal city and took refuge in Solèsmes, making the priory church his cathedral, returning when the inhabitants of Le Mans constrained Hugues to make peace with that prelate.

In February, 1096, Pope Urban II., who was preaching the crusade throughout France, came from Angers to Sablé, and sojourned at Solèsmes. In the twelfth century a crusader of the family who were lords of the manor at Sablé gave the priory church a thorn from the crown of Thorns, which he had bought for a large sum from the Greeks in Constantinople. This generous donor was, doubtless, Robert IV. of Sablé, who joined the crusaders in 1158, had command of the fleet of Richard Cœur de Lion, and became Grand Master of the Templars. This relic is still preserved. In the age of faith pilgrims came in crowds to venerate it, and, at their request, the custom was established of carrying it in procession when any calamity afflicted the country. Its solemn exposition every Easter Monday was the origin of the assemblage held that day in the village of Solèsmes. The authenticity of the Holy Thorn has been more than once attested by miracles. Dom Alphonse Guepin records¹ that he was an eyewitness of a sudden cure effected by touching it.

In 1173, during the wars arising out of the repudiation of Eleanor of Aquitaine by the King of France, Louis VII., and her marriage with Henry Plantagenet, King of England and Duke of Anjou, the priory and village of Solèsmes had much to suffer from the English and Angevine troops.

In the thirteenth century, Pope Gregory IX. conferred by bull on the monks of Canture the right of celebrating the divine office

¹ *Solèsmes et Dom Guéranger*. Par le R. P. Dom Alphonse Guepin. Le Mans, 1876, p. 25.

in times of interdict in their abbey and its dependencies. In the next century, the monks' exemplary lives inspired many benefactors to make donations of additional lands to the priory. The people participated in the prosperity of the monastery. The monks shared a large portion of their wealth with the poor and the working classes, constructing an embankment and lock, making the Sarthe navigable in this place.

In 1375, during the Hundred Years' War, the English troops who had ravaged the abbeys of St. Vincent and Canture, as well as several other monasteries of the province, did not spare Solès-mes. In 1408 Louis II., King of Sicily, Duke of Anjou, Count of Maine and lord of Sablé (father of the celebrated King René), made provision for the celebration of a daily Mass of Requiem for himself after his decease, an obligation which was faithfully fulfilled. Every morning, until the Revolution, after praise, the big priory bell was rung for "the King's Mass," and, after the dispersion, the remembrance of this pious institution long survived in the minds of the inhabitants of the village, as an incident characteristic of the old priory times.

About 1425 the English troops again laid waste the whole country and burnt the priory. A great portion of the archives shared the same fate. The sacrilegious devastators unwittingly took their punishment into their own hands. They gorged themselves with such a quantity of new wine and milk that they brought on a violent dysentery, of which most of them died.

After the disasters of the Hundred Years' War, the old priory arose from its ruins and reached a surprising degree of prosperity at a time when monasticism was almost everywhere on the decline. Hastily repaired after the ravages of the English soldiery, the edifice had lost, with its collateral naves, the amplitude of the basilica, and only a large chapel of irregular proportions, in which the remains of the solid buildings of the eleventh century ill accorded with the improvised portions of the fifteenth, subsisted. Without changing the general design of this modest church, the priors decorated it in a style that made it an almost unique monument of French monastic architecture. One of the priors of this epoch—known to history as the grand priors—encased the Holy Thorn in a silver-gilt shrine, supported by an angel of the same metal. Another, Dom Michel Bureau, was raised to episcopal rank as titular Bishop of Hierapolis. Perhaps the most noteworthy was Jean Bougler, of whom an anecdote is related which well illustrates the spirit that animated the best types of churchmen in the Middle Ages. Passing across the hedge at Sablé one day to meet the lord of the manor, with whom he had had some trouble, his presence stirred up the anger of the haughty châte-

lain. "Monk," said he to the prior, "if I didn't fear God, I'd throw you into the Sarthe." "If you fear God," was the apt reply, "I've nothing to fear." This prior reformed the observance, and under his wise administration monastic studies, for which the French Benedictines have been long famous, flourished.

We now come to a phase of monasticism which had a very deteriorating influence upon it. The rule of St. Benedict and the constant tradition of the monastic order laid down the principle that the abbot of each monastery should be a monk elected by his peers. From the earliest times, however, public or private necessity sometimes constrained the sovereign pontiffs to place a monastery under the guardianship of a secular prelate, who governed it and drew the revenues without being obliged to embrace the monastic state. These innovations were multiplied since the sojourn of the popes at Avignon; and kings, seeing in the custom an easy and legal way of enriching their creatures at the expense of the monastic orders, strove to establish this régime; called the holding of abbeys *in Commendam*, in all the monasteries in their states. In France, this abuse largely prevailed, and dealt a blow at monasticism from which it did not recover itself for a long time. An abbey *in Commendam* was a body without a head, doomed to decadence. In vain the sovereign pontiffs multiplied precautions to limit the power of the *Commendataires* and safeguard the interests of the monks against their rapacity. These measures were almost always ineffectual. In the Concordat concluded between the Pope and the King of France, Leo X. was unable to secure that all the abbeys *in Commendam* should be conformed to the rule; that is, placed under the government of abbots, elected and professed, of the Order of St. Benedict. He stipulated that at least no monastery having a regular abbot should be placed *in Commendam*; but the Court of France began at once to evade, in a thousand ways, this clause protective of monastic freedom.

After the death of Dom Michael Burean, on June 6, 1518, Francis I. made the Bishop of Senlis abbot commendatory of Canture, upon which Solèsmes depended. The monks made a last stand for religious liberty, and elected Jean Bougler; but he had to yield to superior force after undergoing imprisonment, and returned to his priory of Solèsmes, which he continued to govern for nearly forty years more, enriching the church with some valuable sculptures, which have been ever since the admiration of artists. He died on April 11, 1556, and was interred in the Lady Chapel.

After the death of Prior Bougler, the priory was immediately placed *in Commendam*, and the epoch of its decadence began. Its decline and fall were hastened by the religious wars of the time.

Maine was one of the provinces of France which suffered most. History records with what iconoclastic fury the Protestants demolished every monument of Catholic piety upon which they could lay their ruthless hands. The sacking of the churches of Maine in 1562 was the beginning of innumerable destructive ravages. Masters of Sablé in 1567, the Huguenots laid siege to Solèsmes, and met with a stout resistance from the monks and a portion of the people, who barricaded the church. Unable to force the doors, the besiegers were preparing to set fire to them, but were put to flight by a vigorous sortie. In 1589 Landebry, who held the castle of Sablé in the name of Henry IV., took away the big bell of Solèsmes to have cannons cast from it; but it was recaptured by the people and hung in the belfry of the parish church.

Among the commendatory abbots of Canture who succeeded were Cardinal Charles de Bourbon, the King of the League, and his nephew, the Cardinal de Vendôme. Even in the darkest days of its decadence some of the monks of Solèsmes were true to their vocation, and their names are held in benediction. The abbey of Canture was reformed in 1657 by monks of the Congregation of Saint Maur, and the reform was extended to Solèsmes, which was the one hundred and fifty-first monastery reformed by that Congregation, two professed monks of that branch being successively nominated priors in 1670. It obtained possession of the bodies of the martyrs, Boniface, Maximus, Vital and Juliana, brought from the Roman Catacombs, and translated, in 1673, in the midst of a great concourse of clergy and people. Arnould Blouyn, nominated administrator of Solèsmes by the Chapter General of Saint Maur in 1672, carried in his hands the Holy Thorn in the procession. A young girl from Sablé, aged eighteen, who had been for four years suffering from an incurable disease, was miraculously cured during this translation; and every year, on the feast of the holy martyrs, she came to the priory church to return thanks to God.¹ These relics disappeared at the French Revolution; but in 1837 Cardinal Odescalchi presented the priory with the remains of St. Leontius, discovered in the crypt of St. Cyriacus.

The reform of Solèsmes by the congregation of Saint Maur secured the monastery a century and a half of an honorable existence; but, Dom Guepin says, it was not a *renaissance*. "Among all the cloistral priors who succeeded at Solèsmes, not one had or could have had that character of doctor and father without which there is no real superior in a Benedictine monastery. Jean Bougler had no successor before Dom Gueranger."²

¹ Dom Guepin, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

² Dom Guepin, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

The fatal hour at last came. Misunderstood and perverted by an unmindful and unforeseeing age, cunningly oppressed by royalty and nobility, deprived of its natural government and the necessary developments of its inner life, scoffed at by the philosophers, its foundations in some places undermined by heresy, the monastic institution was ready to crumble ; but in falling it covered France with its ruins and left a void in the Church and society which nothing could fill.¹ In 1790 the decree of the Constituent Assembly, which suppressed all the religious orders, gave its death stroke to the Priory of Solèsmes. At the opening of 1791 the monks were driven from their monastery and on the 4th of April of that year Solèsmes and the greater portion of its lands were bought by M. Lenois de Chanteloup who closed the church.

The abandonment of the monastery of Solèsmes lasted forty-two years. In 1817, sixteen years after the Concordat had restored Catholic worship in France, some monks of Saint Maur, assembled at Senlis, made an unsuccessful attempt to revive their congregation. It seemed to be all over with the Benedictine Order in France ; but God had decided otherwise, and the future restorer of this venerable institution was already a lad of twelve, not far from the deserted monastery itself.

Prosper Louis Pascal Gueranger, born at Sablé, April 4, 1805, in what was formerly the convent of the Elizabethines in that town, was scarcely two years old, when his father, Pierre Gueranger, re-established in the old guest house of Solèsmes the college founded in 1602 by Olivier L'Evêque. It was there Prosper spent his whole childhood. He used to tell towards the close of his life how, when he was three and upwards, he was wont to point out to his nurse the old priory as the limit of his walks. He thus very early became familiarized with the place which was to be the scene of his life work. An aptitude for the ecclesiastical state and sacred studies soon displayed itself. He read with avidity and at twelve knew by heart Fleury's Ecclesiastical History ; and seemed to be as familiar with the topography of the Holy Land as a pilgrim from Palestine. He was sent in 1818 to the Royal College of Angers where his fellow-students, with that insight into character which boys sometimes surprisingly evince, named him "the monk." It was unconsciously prophetic. The writings of Joseph de Maistre, which he found in the library of the Abbé Pasquier, chaplain to the college, first implanted in his mind an attachment to the Holy See and an aversion to the Gallicanism which grew with his growth. From Angers he passed to the seminary of Le Mans where began his theology, adding thereto the study of history, the Fathers and

other sources of tradition. Feeling that a life of combined study and liturgical prayer could alone satisfy his aspirations, and seeing in France no house in which the monastic's life was lived as he dreamed of it, he thought of going to Monte Cassino. His appointment as secretary to Mgr. de La Myre-Marry, bishop of Le Mans, dispelled these reflections for the moment. On October 7, 1827, he was ordained by Mgr. de Montblanc, Archbishop of Tours, and on the evening of that very day went to the old monastery of St. Martin, Marmoutier, to place his new life under the patronage of one who is a type of the priest and the apostle as well the patriarch of the monastic life in the West. Within these precincts where ages ago "the pealing anthem swelled the note of praise," he found nothing but silence and desolation. Church and monastery were destroyed; the foundations alone were visible. Heart-wrung at this spectacle, the young priest fell upon his knees and the *Rorate*, that prayer which the Church borrows from the prophets to depict the mourning of Jerusalem escaped from his lips.

Mgr. de La Myre having resigned his see, the Abbé Gueranger accompanied him in the spring of 1828 to Paris, where the reaction against Gallicanism was then in all its intensity and into which he threw himself with ardor, contributing to the "Memorial Catholique" four or five articles bearing on the Roman liturgy to which he had conceived a strong attraction. On the death of Mgr. de La Myre in the autumn of 1829, he was appointed to the parish of the Missions-Etrangères of which the Abbé Dufriche-Desgenettes was then curé. In 1831 he published his first book, a "Treatise on the Election of Bishops."

Meanwhile the old Priory of Solèsmes, which had passed from the possession of M. Lenoir de Chanteloup into that of three rich landowners, who had hoped to make a good thing out of these vast and solidly constructed buildings, was, as previously stated, offered for sale, the speculators not having realized their expectations and being anxious to get their own again out of them. The Abbé Gueranger resolved to save this monument of French monasticism at any cost. He first addressed himself to De Lammenais, whose acquaintance he had made when the editor of the *Avenir* was still a man of light and leading among the ardent spirits whom he had gathered around him in Paris, and before the author of the "Essays on Indifference" had fallen a victim to intellectual pride. He asked him to buy Solèsmes, to establish therein that Congregation of St. Peter, one of the chimerical projects of the great writer. The response was a refusal.

It then occurred to Gueranger to re-establish the Benedictines there. After much thought and prayer he communicated his de-

sign to two or three other priests, who approved of it. On the 23d of July, 1831, he crossed the threshold of the old monastery in company with a few friends. At the sight of the abandoned church, the bare altar, the empty stalls, and the beautiful statuary doomed to almost inevitable destruction, the emotion which had seized him in contemplating the ruins of Marmoutier again filled his soul, and he and the Abbé Fonteinne, vicaire of Sablé, joined their voices in chanting the *Rorate*. Since the last Mass had been celebrated by the monks in 1791, no priest's voice had ever been raised there. Those two poor, almost unknown young priests, with no wealthy people at their back, were the future Abbot of Solèsmes and the first and faithful companion of his labors. There was no powerful and generous nobleman to restore to the servants of God their temporal inheritance. The humble and fervent Christians who were the devout spectators of this scene were to accomplish with a modest fortune what the wealthy had no longer the faith to undertake.¹ Mdme. Gazean, whom the whole town of Sablé venerated as the mother of the poor, labored for the new work with the abnegation and ardent charity of a saint. Other helpers came forward in the persons of the Marquis de Dreux-Brézé, Mdme. Swetchine, foremost in every good work, and Montalembert, the historian of the "Monks of the West." But their efforts had only comparatively trifling results. It needed a year to mature the design. Around the Abbé Gueranger some of the younger clergy of Le Mans gathered sympathetically, but, while they encouraged the young founder, no effective steps were yet taken. The bishop, Mgr. Carron, was slow to give his approval to a work which only existed in the mind of a young priest of twenty-six, admired for his spirit and erudition, but whose mission in the Church none yet suspected.

In the autumn of 1832 it became imperatively necessary to act with decision and promptitude. The demolition of the monastery began. On the 8th of November Mgr. Carron urged the Abbé Gueranger to stop it, and promised to give favorable consideration to the constitutions required for the observance of the Benedictine rule by the future community. But Gueranger had only 500 francs (£20) given him by the Marquis de Dreux-Brézé. The prayers and encouragement of Visitation nuns of Le Mans were his chief reliance in this extremity. He joined with them in a novena to the Blessed Virgin, begun on December 7th, to end on the 15th, the octave of the Immaculate Conception. During the novena the Mdles. Cosnard, despite their limited means, undertook to supply the sum of 6000 francs (£240); and on Decem-

¹ Dom Guepin.

ber 14th the old monastery was legally conveyed to the future disciples of St. Benedict, who took possession of it the next day, the octave of the Immaculate Conception, the very day when the pious nuns were finishing the novena. Four days after, on December 19th, the bishop formally approved the constitution and gave the Church's sanction to the work. It was manifest that the Blessed Virgin had taken it under her patronage. So the French Congregation has always, on the 8th of every recurring December, renewed the act of consecration, which obliges it to honor with special devotion the mystery of the Immaculate Conception. At the same time the Abbé Gueranger placed his undertaking under the protection of the Sacred Heart, vowing to each an altar under that title in the Church of Solèsmes, if, after three years from the day of installation, he should be in a position to continue the work. This double consecration to two mysteries, which, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, were the object of Jansenist blasphemies and hostile criticism, showed in what spirit the restorer of the Benedictine order in France meant to form his disciples.¹ "If it was worth the trouble of being epitomised," he said, in his old age, "my life was nothing else than a reaction against the Jansenist tendency."

The 11th of July, 1833, the Feast of the Translation of the Relics of Saint Benedict in France was the day fixed for the installation of the new community. Great and general was the emotion when the procession entered joyfully the sacred and long-deserted precincts, chanting the appropriate canticle, *In Convertendo Dominus Captivitatem Sion*. The episcopal delegate, the Abbé Phillippe Ménochet, having led the five aspirants to the monastic life to the stalls and the Abbé Gueranger to the prior's place, began the celebration of Mass, sung according to the Roman rite. The community, which from that day chanted the divine office in its integrity according to the Roman rite, did not adopt the monastic Roman rite until the Christmas of 1846. They took the name of Father and the qualification of Dom when they had received ordination, but still wore the dress of secular priests, only assuming the Benedictine habit on the feast of the Assumption, 1836.

The new foundation, like every other work meant to endure, had to stand the test of time and trials. The first and hardest trial was isolation. Around them they found nothing but indifference. With the exception of a few, none knew anything about their work, of which they realized neither the object nor the opportuneness. Within, all who joined them were far from being

¹ Dom Guepin.

steadfast. Of the handful of aspirants who entered only one remained permanently, the Abbé Fonteinne. But the courageous prior counted upon God, and God blessed the faith of his servant.¹ In the spring of 1837 the work, though still in its infancy, was strong enough to obtain the approval of Pope Gregory XVI., who had been a Camaldulense monk and, consequently, a son of St. Benedict, as well as of St. Romuald. The Abbot of St. Paul-outside the Walls, Dom Vincent Bini, was authorized by the apostolic delegation to receive, in the name of the Sovereign Pontiff, the monastic profession of the prior of Solèsmes, a ceremony which took place in the basilica of St. Paul, on July 26, 1837. By a more than fortuitous coincidence, one of those present at this solemnity was the Abbé Lacordaire, whom the example and counsels of Gueranger shortly after determined to undertake the restoration of the Order of Friars Preachers in France. On the 1st of September the Pope gave his definite sanction to the new monastic revival. Letters issued under the seal of the Fisherman's Ring, and beginning with the words *Innumeras inter*, raised the priory to the rank of an abbey and declared it the head of a new congregation of the Order of St. Benedict, enacted under the name of the Congregation of France, affiliated to that of Monte Cassino, heiress of the ancient Congregations of Cluny, Saint Maur and Saint Vannes. The same brief instituted the Very Rev. Dom Prosper Gueranger, Abbot of Solèsmes and Superior-General of this congregation. On October 31, 1837, eve of the Feast of All Saints, the new abbot took possession of his monastery and pontificated for the first time in his abbatial church.

The subsequent career of the restorer of Solèsmes is written largely in the history of the contemporary church of France. The restoration of the Benedictine Order is closely associated with the restoration of the Roman liturgy in that country—a subject upon which the learned Abbot of Solesmes brought to bear all the resources of his extensive knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquity. In the first and second volumes of his “*Institutions Liturgiques*” (1840–41) he showed the injury that liturgical innovations had done to religion in France, and that the most effectual means of reviving faith and drawing closer the ties which linked that country to the Holy See was to restore the Roman liturgy—a revolution in ritual which he lived to accomplish, despite the fact that all the dioceses, with the exception of twelve, had new liturgies, and that from all sides the Gallicans raised an outcry against what they denounced as “a conspiracy.” Polemical pamphlets espousing both sides of the controversy multiplied.

¹ Dom Guepin.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 122, 123.

Gueranger, in a letter to the Archbishop of Rheims, entitled "*Le droit de la Liturgie*," posed the canonical question with his usual perspicacity, and in his "*Defence des Institutions Liturgiques*" (1844) replied to certain strictures of the Archbishop of Toulouse, and in 1846-47 answered Mgr. Fayel, Bishop of Orleans, in a new defence of the same work. "The effect of these replies," says Dom Guepin, "was crushing. From that time the cause was completely gained, and no serious man ventured to take in hand the cause of the Gallican liturgies. The first time he had audience of Pius IX., that saintly Pontiff greeted him with the exclamation, "Here's the restorer of the Roman liturgy in France." The far-sighted Pope divined the important consequences involved in this momentous change. At the end of the struggle (1851) appeared the third volume of the "*Institutions Liturgiques*." The first volume of his favorite and best-known work, the "*Année Liturgique*," had appeared in 1841. Death cut short its completion when, after having gone through the whole round of movable feasts, he had come to the octave of Corpus Christi and the feast of the Sacred Heart. "If I have done good to souls," he said, "it is by the '*Année Liturgique*.'" The discussion immediately preceding the promulgation of the Immaculate Conception was the next important controversy in which he took part. He was the first French prelate who promulgated the definition, and the abbatial church of Solèsmes was the first in France in which this unique prerogative of the Virgin Mother was solemnly acclaimed on December 16, 1854.

Meanwhile the new French Benedictine Congregation took more definite shape when, in 1853, Mgr. Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, handed over to Abbot Gueranger the monastery founded by St. Martin of Tours at Ligugè, which he had restored and of which, on November 25th of that year, under the auspices of St. Catherine V. M., four monks of Solesmes took possession. This monastery was erected into an abbey on November 18, 1856.

The publication of the "*History of the Church and the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century*," by the Prince de Broglie, called forth from Dom Guéranger a series of thirty articles in the "*Univers*," in which he combated the new historical school that strove to banish the supernatural from the world and to explain all the phenomena of history from a purely rationalistic point of view. Other articles attacked the naturalist tendencies in philosophy and history, and he had the satisfaction of subsequently seeing the doctrines he had denounced formally condemned in the encyclical of December 8, 1864. He next arraigned theological naturalism in vindicating Mary of Agreda's "*Mystical City*" against the unmerited censure of the Sorbonne.

On July 11, 1865, another priory was added to the congregation at Marseilles, erected into an abbey on February 4, 1876, by Pius IX., who declared that Dom Gueranger's memory "would be eternally in benediction." With that absence of national exclusiveness which has always characterized truly Catholic minds, he had largely aided in promoting the restoration of the famous Abbey of Saint Martin's of Beuron, on the banks of the Danube, given to the German Benedictines by the Princess Catherine of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. In the year succeeding the foundation of the Marseilles monastery, on October 8, 1866, the Bishop of Le Mans laid the first stone of a Benedictine convent of nuns at Solèsmes under the invocation of St. Cecilia, and on the 14th of August, 1867, five choir and two lay sisters received the veil, making their profession on August 15, 1868, Dom Gueranger having, on November 22, 1867, sung pontifically, for the first time, the Mass of St. Cecilia in the midst of the new religious family.

The crowning act of Gueranger's busy life—busier by far than that of many who sneer at cloistered religious as "idle monks"—was the part he played in connection with the now famous and historical Vatican Council and the great work it accomplished—the promulgation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility and the final extinction of Gallicanism, which had contained the germs of a possible schism. Convoked to the council in his quality of abbot, but excused from attendance on account of his increasing infirmities, he nevertheless largely influenced its deliberations from the silence and solitude of his monastic cell, in which he penned his powerful pamphlet, "*La Monarchie Pontificale*," the marvellous and, as it were, spontaneous fruit of a theological maturity of which few examples could be cited, and in which the assembled Fathers of the Council found the solution so many sophisms had concealed.¹

Such brilliant services did not pass unrecognized and unrewarded. Pius IX. had already nominated him Consultor of the Congregations of Rites and of the Index and conferred on him the privilege of wearing the *cappa magna* like prelates of the highest rank.

The completion of the conventual Church of the Benedictine nuns and the writing of a beautiful monograph on "St. Cecilia and Roman Society," filled up the remainder of his life. Growing weakness alone prevented him from adding to his other masterly works a life of St. Benedict. Although struggling against the malady which was only to end with his death, he went to Marseilles in mid-winter, 1874, to inaugurate the new Benedictine monastery. On his return to Solèsmes, after Matins on Christmas

Eve, he sang the genealogy of the Saviour in accordance with monastic usage, but at the *gloria in excelsis* he fainted and had to be carried away half inanimate. After this crisis they urged him in vain to take some rest. "I would wish to die standing like St. Benedict," he replied; alluding to the heroic fortitude with which the patriarch and law-giver of the Monks of the West met death face to face. If this wish was denied him, his closing hours were none the less a suggestive reflex of his whole life. Death almost surprised him in the humble ministry of preparing a child for its first communion. A violent fever laid him prostrate, and, after an agony of three days, while the monks, gathered round his death-bed, renewed their profession in his hands and chanted those solemn psalms which have for ages made music in the ears of young and old, he quietly passed away on Saturday, the 30th of January, 1874.

The body of the venerated Abbot of Solèsmes was borne in procession to the abbatial Church of St. Cecilia, where the nuns kept watch by it during the night. Representatives of nearly all the religious orders, an immense concourse of priests, and the civil and military authorities of the department were present at the obsequies on the next day, when Mgr. d'Outremont, Bishop of Le Mans, pronounced a touching allocution. At the Month's Mind an eloquent and more elaborate panegyric was delivered by Mgr. Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, of whom the Abbot himself had said one day in private conversation with one of his monks: "If you wish that one with a knowledge of the subject should speak of me after my death, it is the Bishop of Poitiers who should be invited to do so." But worthily as Mgr. Pie discharged the task allotted to him, it was the Pope himself in his brief, *Ecclesiasticis viris*, of March 19, 1875, who paid the highest tribute to his worth and work. "Among the Churchmen of our time the most distinguished by their religion, zeal, learning and skill in promoting Catholic interests must be justly inscribed our dearest one, Prosper Gueranger, Abbot of St. Peter's, Solèsmes and Superior-General of the Benedictines of the Congregation of France. Endowed with a powerful mind, possessing marvellous erudition and deep knowledge of canon law, he devoted the whole of his long life to courageously defending in writings of the highest value the doctrine of the Roman Church and the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff, defeating the efforts and refuting the errors of those who combated them. And when, with the applause of Christendom, we by a solemn decree confirmed the heavenly privilege of the Immaculate Conception of the holy Mother of God; and, quite recently, when, with the approval of a numerously attended council which brought together bishops from all parts of the Catholic world, we defined

the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff teaching *ex cathedrâ*, our dear son Prosper did not fail in his duty as a Catholic writer : he published works full of faith and sacred science which were a fresh proof of his superior mind and his unshakable devotion to the Chair of St. Peter. But the chief object of his labor and his thoughts was to restore the Roman liturgy in France to its ancient rights. He carried out this undertaking so well, that it is to his writings, and, at the same time, to his singular skill more than to any other influence that we owe it that, before his death, all the dioceses in France were seen to adopt the rites of the Roman Church. His life, wholly employed we may say in the interests of the Catholic cause, adds the éclat of a new splendor to the Benedictine Congregation of France, already illustrious in so many other ways and seems to demand from us new testimony of our good will and affection." Again in the brief, *Decebat Profecto*, of March 29, 1875, addressed to Mgr. Pie, he refers to him as "the most brilliant glory of the Order of St. Benedict" and "a providential instrument for the restoration of the ruined religious orders in France and to make manifest to all their very great utility," and attributes to her "laborious activity, grace and science," that "identity of opinions among all true Catholics, that universal devotedness and truly filial laws by which France is united to the Holy See."

R. F. O'CONNOR.

CATHOLIC PROTECTORIES AND REFORMATORIES.

THE motives which have led to the establishment of institutions for the relief of the poor, the correction of the criminal, the care of orphans and widows, the reformation of juvenile delinquents, the education of the ignorant, the treatment and cure of disease, the care of the insane, the protection and education of the deaf, dumb and blind, and, in fact, for the relief of all the temporal misfortunes of mankind, may be classified under three principal heads—Charity, Philanthropy and Public Policy—these have been the chief motives for these great and varied works of amelioration. The first of these motives, charity, is the distinguishing incentive which has actuated Christianity, the Christian Church and its members. Philanthropy has supplied the reason for such works by man, as a member of the human family, actuated by motives of humanity; and Public Policy is that which leads to such measures on the part of the sovereign, the nation, the people, the state.

Charity is the highest, the purest and the most perfect motive for good—the corner-stone of the Christian Church; for without charity Christianity could not exist. Not only is it one of the theological virtues, but it is the greatest of them, and far transcends the noble virtues of faith and hope. It is one of the twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost. That splendid eulogy which St. Paul pronounces on charity in the thirteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians should be engraved on every human heart. It leaves nothing for human pen to write. The Saviour Himself hath also said, “By this shall men know that ye are my disciples, because ye love one another.”

Animated by this greatest of virtues, Christianity has in every age proved its divine origin by its magnificent charities. Scarcely a work of mercy in the world but is either of Christian origin or is an imitation of Christian works or traces its inspiration therefrom. In the earliest ages the poor were taken care of from a common fund, and by an ancient regulation one-fourth of the Church's revenues were expended for the poor. When the Church had acquired strength and had evangelized the nations, there sprang from her fruitful womb those benevolent religious orders, whose sole motive and occupation were works of charity. Charity for the human soul and charity for the human body went hand-in-hand together. Among the earliest works of Christian

charity was the double order or institute of Fontevrand for penitents both male and female, which achieved miracles of mercy in France, Spain and England. As early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Church had apostolic men preaching and laboring for the redemption of fallen women, thus giving the nineteenth century the models for its Magdalen asylums. The ransom of slaves became a leading work of mercy; Christians even became slaves in order to manumit the slaves; and these exalted works bore fruit in the abolition of slavery in many lands. Woman was emancipated from the thralldom in which heathenism had placed and left her. Missions and institutes were founded for teaching Christian doctrine to the young. The Trinitarians were an order of Fathers for the redemption of Christian slaves, and as early as the thirteenth century the ancient order of Mercy existed and had its saints and martyrs. The ancient order of Religious Penitents, or White Daughters, as they were called, were the precursors of our modern Magdalens. Hospitals for the relief of every form of suffering sprang up in every land; the poor, the lepers, the insane, exiles—all had their special homes, institutes and hospitals. Charitable institutions were as numerous as the forms of human wants and sufferings. Ingenuity varied the provision to the necessity, and was untiring in spreading intelligence, in bestowing the gifts of Christian charity, in dispensing her treasures and distributing her succors. Such was the elevation attained by the institutes of mercy that religion not only soothed the sorrows of humanity, but she most tenderly regarded the imperfections of the sufferers, practiced a refined and delicate condescension and a gentle regard for human self-love and for the frailties of the race. Well has it been said that such great works of mercy as the Christian membership has performed from the motive of charity, since the divine accomplishment of our redemption, would be accepted by heaven as an ample atonement for the sins of mankind. Well has a great Catholic writer exclaimed: "Heavenly religion, that compels us to love those wretched beings by whom it is calumniated!"

So, too, has it been with works of education; for charity did not stop at instructing the soul in Christian doctrine and in relieving human suffering. It aspired also to the achievement of great results in the education of the mind and character of men. The teaching orders of the Church have shown the same energy of goodness as the various orders of mercy and foreign missions. Conspicuous among these have been the Benedictines and the Jesuits. But in our times the teaching orders of the Catholic Church, both male and female, have become both numerous and beneficent. Countless schools, colleges and universities—in the

past eminently, and in the present pre-eminently—attest the charities of the Catholic Church in the education of the human intellect and in the formation and reformation of the human character and conscience.

It would require many volumes to give an adequate account of the great Christian labors for the amelioration of human suffering and of the splendid institutions of charity by which the Catholic Church has illustrated her divine mission and sanctified her career in every age. We have been able in this paper to make but a faint allusion to them. In our own country she has been true to her mission and traditions, and the charities of the Church in America are worthy of the most glorious ages and nations of Christendom. Let us briefly glance at her latest compiled statistics of education and charity. In 1894 the Catholic Church in the United States had nine universities, one hundred and eighty-two high schools for boys and six hundred and nine for girls, and three thousand seven hundred and thirty-one parochial schools, in which a gratuitous education was given to seven hundred and seventy-five thousand and sixty future citizens of the republic. These future citizens and defenders of our country are taught in these Catholic schools their duty to God, to their fellow-citizens and their country. The Catholic teachings on the subject of our relations and duties to our country were well expressed in the address of Cardinal Gibbons to the Baltimore Catholic Club, when he said, "In no country on the face of the earth has the difficult problem been better solved than in the United States—the problem of maintaining harmonious relations between Church and State. Here the Church and State run in parallel lines, and do not conflict with one another. The Church upholds the State; religion educates the State, and proclaims the divinity of the laws under which we live. Religion tells us that there is no authority but from God, and that all law is sacred. Religion sanctifies the virtue of obedience and respect for civil laws by teaching that obedience to civil authority is not a servile homage paid to man, but a homage of freemen to God Himself."

But the Catholic Church has also cause to glory in her institutions of charity in America. Here she has two hundred and thirty-nine orphan asylums maintaining and educating thirty thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven inmates for the duties of American citizenship in accordance with the principles announced by Cardinal Gibbons. She has also eight hundred and one other charitable institutions, such as hospitals, protectories, reformatories, nurseries, homes, missions and similar institutions of mercy and relief. The whole number of persons educated and supported in our Catholic institutions in 1894 was the grand

total of eight hundred and sixty thousand three hundred and fifty-six.

We desire particularly to mention these Christian treasures in the State of Pennsylvania and in the city of Philadelphia, because they are the home of our REVIEW and because they have a special bearing upon a branch of our subject. In the State of Pennsylvania Catholics maintain, besides Catholic colleges, sixty high-schools, three hundred and twenty-one parochial schools, in which are educated seventy-two thousand Catholic children, eighteen asylums and thirty-three other charitable institutions. In the archdiocese of Philadelphia, besides three colleges, there are eighteen high-schools, ninety-eight parochial schools, which educate over thirty-two thousand Catholic children, ten asylums, with thirty-three hundred and thirty-two inmates, and in twenty-three other charitable institutions are maintained and educated, together with the inmates already enumerated, a grand total of thirty-nine thousand seven hundred and eighty persons.

Reformatories and protectories occupy a pre-eminent position among the works which have been prompted either by charity, philanthropy or public policy. They are the most direct efforts to solve the paramount problem of the child and to obey the injunction of our Saviour to permit little children to come unto Him and to forbid them not. The efforts of the Catholic Church and of her followers in the direction of protectories and reformatories have far excelled all others, whether actuated by charity, philanthropy or public policy. They have gone farther than any other institutions in solving the child problem and in enabling the State itself to solve it. This we expect to prove by disinterested testimony. And we think that we can show that Catholic institutions of this character are the best agents of the State in the execution by the State of one of its most sacred, difficult and important duties. And, further, that, while this function of the public economies is better performed, it is more economically executed than by the institutions for the same purpose founded and managed by the State. The State is fortunate in securing the agency of private institutions for the performance of this great and paramount public service.

There are many questions that enter into the consideration of this subject, such as the recognition by the State of its duty to take charge of, care for and educate properly its juvenile delinquents and vagrants and all such children as, by their poverty, viciousness, intemperance and neglect of their parents, are thrown upon the public for care, support and education. Such, too, is the important question of the paramount importance of religion as a part of every education and the absolute right of every indi-

vidual within the territories of the State, "all mankind," whether child or adult, freeman or prisoner, man or woman, innocent or guilty, pauper or criminal, to the full enjoyment of religious liberty and freedom of conscience and religious worship. All these shall receive a share of our attention.

Eminent among the charitable institutions of the Catholic Church throughout the Christian world, to which we have had but space for a passing allusion, are her splendid protectories and reformatories. Among the leading institutions of this kind a very few are the Catholic Refuge at Anteuil, Paris; Issy, Mettray and other similar ones in France; the Catholic Reformatory of St. Kevin, in the county Wicklow, and the Catholic Industrial School of Artane, near Dublin. In the United States we can mention with Christian pride the New York Catholic Protectory, the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin for the Protection of Homeless and Destitute Children, which has one of its houses in Lafayette Place, New York City, and the other at Mount Loretto, on Staten Island, New York State; the Boland Trade School, the Institutions of the Sisters of Mercy, St. Ann's Home for Destitute and Homeless Children, the Institution of the Sisters of St. Dominic, the Foundling Hospital, the House of the Holy Family for Befriending Children and Young Girls, St. Agatha's Home for Children, at Nanuet; there being in the city of New York alone no less than nine industrial and reform schools; the Catholic Protectory, at Buffalo; St. Mary's Industrial School for Boys, near Baltimore; House of the Angel Guardian and the Homes for Destitute Catholics, at Boston; six industrial schools in the archdiocese of Chicago; St. Francis de Sales Industrial School for Boys, at Eddington, in Pennsylvania; four industrial schools and reformatories in St. Louis; three asylums and protectories in the archdiocese of St. Paul; one industrial school in San Francisco; two industrial schools in Brooklyn; a protectory and a reformatory for girls in Cleveland; an industrial school at Seattle; three industrial schools and reformatories in the Diocese of Newark; two industrial schools and protectories at Pittsburgh; three industrial schools in the diocese of St. Cloud; one protectorate in Winona; and Magdalen asylums, orphan asylums and other charitable institutions for both sexes which greatly partake of the work and aims of Catholic protectories and reformatories, too numerous throughout the length and breadth of our country to be particularly named.

What have eminent and learned Protestants themselves said of these Catholic institutions? What have they testified to in regard to these Catholic institutions as the very best agents and servants of the State in the great and good works which public policy and

public duty have impelled the State to undertake? The late George William Curtis, as distinguished for his eloquence and learning as for his patriotism and public spirit, said: "It is impossible not to recognize the fact that the charitable foundations of the Roman Church are the most comprehensive, the most vigorous and the most efficient known in history. . . . I cannot stop to speak of the various forms of the charity of that Church; but it is to one of its saints that civilization owes the institution of the Sisters of Charity, whose benign service is known even in the hospitals of other denominations." The *New York Observer*, a thoroughly Protestant journal, devoted five weekly articles, beginning in April 20, 1893, to detailed and eulogistic accounts of the charities of the Catholic Church in New York to what it calls "this far-reaching array of philanthropic works." The Rt. Rev. Dr. Doane, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Albany, referring to distinctively Catholic institutions of charity, said before the New York Constitutional Convention in 1894: "I honor the Roman Church from the bottom of my heart for the stand she has taken in her ministries to the sick and to the poor." And the Hon. Joseph H. Choate, the president of that convention, said: "The church that I refer to in particular"—the Roman Catholic—"has, so far as I can learn, led the way in charitable work, and has been an example to all other churches, and the great business of churches of all kinds, so far as I can understand the present theory of church organizations, centers in charity—doing good to our fellow-men." The eminent speaker who gave this last testimony in favor of Catholic works of charity is a witness worthy of special weight, since he is the president of the New York State Charities Aid Society and a member of the board of trustees of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. These tributes to our institutions of charity are selected from countless others on account of—we will not say their hostility to the Catholic Church—but of the well-known disinterestedness and standing of the witnesses.

While Catholic protectories and reformatories constitute the smallest number in kind of our Catholic institutions, since they are only needed in large cities, they constitute, where needed, the most important. If space permitted, we would like to give a detailed account of the great institution at Paris, where workshops are conducted for instructing the boys in engraving, carving, manufacturing instruments of precision, where a practical manufacturer presides over each trade, and where the inmates are thoroughly instructed by the Christian Brothers in Christian doctrine and in the practice of Christian morals and precepts. We would like to speak in detail of the great protectory at Artane, where the finest

ecclesiastical music is produced by a choir of boys led by one of their own number; where secular and religious instruction is zealously imparted; where a small boy can produce a pair of stockings in fifteen minutes; where beautiful rosaries and crucifixes are wrought; where tasteful Glengary caps are made, blouses by young tailors, shoes by young shoemakers, complete sets of harness are made and mounted in silver-plated ware; and where the carpenter shops exhibit such splendid work. There are several such institutions in Europe, and our own country is not without such jewels to bear witness of the ever-active charity of the Catholic Church.

The two most extensive and successful Catholic institutions of the kind in this country are those of the "Mission of the Immaculate Virgin for the Protection of Homeless and Destitute Children," which is a noble example of protectories exclusively as such; and the "New York Catholic Protectory," which happily and signally combines the features, the works and the benign results of both protectory and reformatory.

The Mission of the Immaculate Virgin is purely a protectory, for the tests of admission to its blessings are restricted to the homeless or friendless. Juvenile delinquency forms no feature in its two institutions, one of which is located in Lafayette Place, in the City of New York, where three hundred and ninety-five boys are kept; and the other at Mount Loretto, on Staten Island, where on an extensive estate there are thirteen hundred and fifty-four boys and one hundred and thirty-three girls. At both these institutions the buildings are numerous, spacious and enduring. The whole number of homeless and friendless children provided for is sixteen hundred and ninety-one, of whom fifteen hundred and twenty-nine are boys, and the remainder are girls. This noble institution was founded by Father John Drumgoole, a man whose humility and charity were saintly, and whose good deeds were countless. The present number of clergymen in charge is four, and there are twenty-seven sisters, twenty-seven lay teachers, with male help eighty-two, and female help eighty-six.

This good work of looking after the more tender waifs of the City of New York was commenced by the Society of St. Vincent de Paul; then Cardinal McCloskey appointed "Father John," as he was familiarly known, at his own request, to take charge of the work, which needed a head. St. Joseph's Union was formed in 1876, the members of which throughout the country contributed only twenty-five cents a year; and the good Father established a little newspaper called *The Homeless Child and Messenger of St. Joseph's Union*, a copy of which is still sent to each of the members, now numbering several hundred thousand. Certain spiritual

benefits have been secured to the members. This vast institution was started in a hired house, No. 55 Warren Street; now the buildings at the northeast corner of Bond Street and Lafayette Place are equal to any institutional buildings in the city.

The estate at Mount Loretto comprises six hundred and fifty acres of land, three hundred of which are cultivated by the boys. The main building, which stands in the centre of this magnificent farm, cost \$500,000, a large and imposing structure, capable of accommodating nearly two thousand boys. On the estate is a bathing establishment, an immense stable, a curiosity to see, in which are kept one hundred and twenty-five head of cattle, sixty-nine horses, six hundred pigs, one hundred sheep, and thousands of chickens. It is said to be the largest stable in the Empire State. Around the central building, or home of the boys, are conveniently grouped the different shops and the houses in which reside the master-mechanics, who instruct the boys in their different trades, which are numerous and useful ones. The boys are divided into seven classes, commencing with the nursery and gradually culminating in the rank of apprentices. After a boy has served out his apprenticeship, he is promoted to the Trades Hall, where his industrial training is proportionately advanced, and now as a "trades boy" he is transferred to a separate part of the dormitory, and in a different part of the main building. He has the use of a fine library, chooses his own clothes at the tailoring establishment, and is distinguished on Sundays by the white shirt he wears. On mastering his trade, he is promoted to the Free Trade Hall, and it often happens he attains to a "professorship" in the very institution where he commenced. The ages of the boys range from four to twenty-one years, a class between the orphan and the juvenile delinquent. On entering the Free Trade Hall the boy receives a weekly salary, has a private bedroom of his own, is trusted with liberty of going and coming at pleasure, can attend places of innocent amusement, and is only placed under the restriction of not visiting places where intoxicating liquors are sold. Good positions are procured in the city for the advanced trades boys, who continue to reside at the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin, in Lafayette Place, for which they pay a nominal price of one or two dollars per week. Boys showing superior minds are sent to college, and there are now eight or more of the boys studying for the priesthood. One of the Mount Loretto boys is receiving a first-class musical education, and another is studying medicine. Some of the trades taught are tailoring, shoemaking, printing and such like. The Institution is primarily intended for boys, but the girls thrown in its way by Providence are received, and these are provided with the best accommodations in St. Eliza-

both Home, where they, too, are instructed in useful handicraft and trades, and they make themselves useful in darning the stockings and mending the clothes of the boys. There is a very fine battalion of military cadets, composed of the larger boys.

All the inmates of the Mission are reared up to be good Christians and worthy citizens. They all manifest the greatest gratitude to their benefactors, and the warmest affection for their Chaplains and the Sisters.

The *New York Observer* said, in 1893, of the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin: "This Institution, which fills a gap between the orphan and the intractable boy, was founded twenty-five years ago by Father John Drumgoole, who has been styled the 'humblest and most benevolent of New York's priests.' Through his untiring energy, perseverance and admirable management, the work made rapid strides from a modest beginning to a noble self-supporting institution, caring for and instructing one thousand seven hundred boys and girls."

Among the admiring visitors to Mount Loretto in the lifetime of Father Drumgoole, was the Prime Minister of England, Lord Roseberry, who became an ardent admirer of "Father John" and his work, and a friend of one of the boys named "Pat," whom he afterwards sent to college. The following letter from Lord Roseberry to Father Drumgoole cannot but prove interesting:

MY DEAR FATHER:

I cannot get away to say good-bye to you to-day, but I must in the first place send my address to you: "2 Berkley Square, London, W.," that you may write and tell me how your good work is getting on, and how "Pat" is progressing and what money, from time to time, you want for him. And in the second place, I must express my thankfulness to have been brought face to face with you, and with your noble work. I have never left you or your house without feeling better for it, and without feeling that I had got an insight into a higher and holier life, than men are generally privileged to lead; or indeed capable of leading. I hope you may long be spared for it, and that I may have the pleasure of seeing you and your institution prospering and strengthening, every year more and more. Will you devote a little of Pat's money to having him photographed, and sending me a copy. God bless you, if that may be said without presumption to you, from

ROSEBERRY.

The Rev. John Drumgoole was also called the Don Bosco of America. His successor is the Rev. James J. Dougherty, under whose management the Mission is growing in usefulness and honor.

There are in every thoughtful and studious mind certain ideals: those conceptions of the perfect, which are accomplished by selecting and assembling into one the beauties and perfections of many. It is thus that the benefactors of their race, the philanthropic, the charitable, the friends of the child, the statesman, the Christian, the good Samaritan, and the benevolent, in studying the

child problem, have in their minds the conception of an ideal institution—a model protectory or reformatory. In the mind of the present writer the New York Catholic Protectory is such an ideal.

This institution is the first of its kind in America. Called into existence by the saddening necessities of a great city, it has bravely met an appalling demand of humanity upon Christian charity. It has done more than any other institution to solve the fearful problem of the child. It combines the features of protectory and reformatory. It extends its saving benefits with equal charity and zeal to the girl as well as to the boy. Secular and religious education are equally imparted to its inmates; the soul is trained for Heaven, the mind and character of the juvenile delinquent and vagrant recover their self-respect; industrial training is one of its leading features, and religion, patriotism and education unite in creating the Christian, the citizen, and an industrial producer in the general public economics of the nation.

The true character of the protectory can best be known from the three classes of children it is authorized to receive and care for by its charter. "1. Children under the age of fourteen years, who, by consent in writing of their parents or guardians, may be entrusted to it for protection or reformation. 2. Children between seven and fourteen years of age, who may be committed to the care of such corporation as idle, truant, vicious, or homeless children, by order of any magistrate in the city of New York empowered by law to make committal of children for any such cause. 3. Children of the like age who may be transferred, at the option of the Commissioners of Public Charities and Correction of the city of New York, to such corporation."

Dr. Levi Silliman Ives, a distinguished convert to the Catholic faith, after a pilgrimage to Rome and laying at the feet of Pius IX. the episcopal ring which had been placed on his finger when he was appointed the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of North Carolina, was the founder and first president of the protectory. From the very start he had the sympathy and support of that illustrious prelate, John Hughes, the great Archbishop of New York. It was founded by private Catholic charities, and two years of steady growth and success passed before it was employed by the State of New York, as its agent, to perform that part of the municipal duty which public policy and public obligation imposed upon the State, in respect to the two classes of children, especially designated as 2 and 3 in the charter. This contract between the State and the chartered protectory related only to such Catholic children as fell within those two classes. All thought of proselytizing children not of the Catholic faith, was disclaimed, and the pledge has ever been faithfully redeemed. This was proven by a

correspondence between Mr. Louis Binsse, president of the Catholic Union and the present writer who was then secretary of the protectory, in which the secretary refuted the charge made by the Evangelical Alliance before the legislature that Protestant children were received and proselytized in the protectory. After stating the exactness with which the religion of all committed children is ascertained; how exceptions to the general rule of receiving only Catholic children, *though extremely few*, sometimes occurred at the special request of parents or children, the secretary's letter says: "Protestant or non-Catholic children have never been compelled in the protectory to attend Mass against their own or their parents' wills. I remember some years ago having made this very inquiry myself of the brother rector of the male department, and he informed me in the presence of the Executive Committee that there were then several Protestant boys in the protectory, and that they were permitted every Sunday to attend the services of the nearest Protestant Church, and a brother or other official of the protectory went thither and returned with them for their protection. The same thing will be done again whenever the same occasion arises for so doing." The secretary's letter then says: "The New York Catholic Protectory, as its name imports, is a Catholic Institution, and designed only for Catholic children. We advertise our true character to the world. We do not sail under false colors or under deceptive names. We do not claim the disingenuous style of non-sectarian, a term designating a system, which, when tested in the crucible of constitutional and social rights and guarantees, . . . proves to be the quintessence of sectarianism. The fact that we claim to be a Catholic institution and desire none but Catholic children to be committed to us, proves that we do not desire to interfere with the religious beliefs of Protestant children, or to have opportunities for proselytizing non-Catholic children." We will show later on that the creation of the Catholic protectory and the methods of the New York system, under which it now flourishes, tend greatly to prevent proselytism.

In his appeal to the Catholics of New York at the commencement of the Protectory, in 1863, Dr. Ives said: "Vast numbers of these defenceless young creatures are daily wandering over the face of this great city, exposed to all the horrors of hopeless poverty—to the allurements of vice and crime in every debasing and disgusting form. . . . Our object is to extend to these little sufferers a helping hand; to raise them from their state of degradation and misery, and to place them in a condition in which they may have a fair chance to work out for themselves a better destiny; to become, in short, instruments of good to society and an honor

to their race. . . . What higher motive of action, then, can we have than the knowledge or belief that our organization is to place within their reach the salvation of thousands of destitute Catholic children—children, who, under their present circumstances, are almost certain to lose their faith, and consequently to peril their souls. Those children are a special trust from Almighty God, and every Catholic, under authority of the Church, has a fearful responsibility in the matter of their salvation. It is not necessary that a Catholic should be a bishop or a priest to fix upon him this responsibility. It is true, bishops and priests are sent to direct and bless the work ; but, it is to be accomplished, in a considerable degree, by our co-operation. We are now called upon by the highest authority of the Church among us to give that co-operation. In truth, we go forth to the fulfilment of our trust under the special guidance and benediction of our Most Reverend Archbishop."

Archbishop Hughes, in introducing Dr. Ives to lecture before a large assembly in New York, in 1864, said, among many grand and noble words: "What I chiefly desire is, to avail myself of the first public opportunity afforded me to give assurance of the very sincere and earnest interest which I feel in the success of the noble work called the 'Catholic Reformatory.' It is a work which commends itself to the best sympathies and warmest charities of all. . . . The time, I trust, is not far distant, when this Catholic Reformatory will take its rank among the most flourishing of the many admirable institutions of charity which reflect so much honor on this metropolis, and which are hardly to be found surpassed in any city of the world ; when it will become a source of incalculable blessings to thousands of poor, destitute, vagrant children, who will find in it a safe refuge from the dangers and temptations to which they have been exposed ; where their spiritual as well as temporal wants will be duly cared for ; where they will be trained up in the knowledge of their holy faith, and in the practice of its holy precepts, and go forth afterwards to become sober, industrious, virtuous members of society."

The success of the Protectory has been phenomenal. Its present grand proportions, and immense benefactions, have been the joint results of private charity and of the compensation it has received during thirty years from the State of New York under an exact and fair contract, for performing for the State an important part of that public obligation which is inherent in the very organism of the State. These private charities, in the aggregate, may be conjectured when it is stated that a single fair held for the Protectory netted over \$100,000. From the ninth annual report (1872) we learn that from the foundation of the Protectory, in 1863, there

had been expended, for all purposes, \$1,430,706.85; all which was laid out in accordance with the requirements of the law. Of this sum the public contributed less than half, \$674,110.53, while private charities contributed \$756,593.32. It is estimated that the moneys received from the State, or rather from the city of New York, only suffice for the support of the inmates, the waifs of the city who are the wards of the Protectory; and the real estate and personal property accumulated in thirty-two years have been the result of private charities and efforts. Of this last sum, private benevolence contributed \$413,897.18; the labor of the children, \$102,791.52; and the credit of the Protectory, \$244,019.71. These figures, proportionately extended to 1895, would show the increased proportions relatively contributed by the public and by the Protectorate.

The work of this vast institution is conducted in three separate and distinct departments. The House of Reception at Nos. 415 and 417 Broome Street, in the city of New York; the male department located on the north side of the public highway leading to Van Nest station in West Chester county; and the female department on the south side of the same highway.

At the House of Reception are all the city business offices, the salesrooms for the shoe department, and the temporary home of the boys and girls as they are committed, and in which, under the care of the Sisters of Charity, they are provided with schooling, religious instruction and services, and properly prepared in point of health, for transfer to the West Chester institution. The term of detention at the House of Reception is the period of quarantine required by the health regulations of the city of New York.

The male and female departments at West Chester embrace extensive and massive buildings erected on a large farm purchased for the purpose, of which two-thirds are given to the male department and the remainder to the female department. The former is in charge of the Christian Brothers, about seventy-five in number, and the present rector is Brother Leontine. The latter is in charge of Sisters of Charity, forty in number, with Sister M. Anita as Superioress. In the schools at West Chester are taught catechism of Christian Doctrine, reading, spelling, arithmetic, penmanship, grammar, history, geography, free-hand drawing, linear drawing, stenography and typewriting. At the male department the following industrial trades are taught: Printing, electrotyping, shoe-making, tailoring, chair-caning, stocking-knitting, music, farming, dairy work, gardening, blacksmithing, wheelwright, carpentry, machinery, and painting. There is also a musical band and orchestra composed of Protectory boys, regarded as among the best in the city, and a battalion of two hundred cadets under thorough

military training. There are also in both institutions fine libraries. In the female department are taught dress-making, glove-making, shirt-making, cooking, stenography, typewriting, and other industries.

The incorporated Protectory is composed of lay trustees, and the mayor, recorder and controller of the city are *ex officio* members of the board. The presidents of the Protectory have been Levi Silliman Ives, Henry James Anderson, Henry L. Hoguet, Richard H. Clarke and Bryan Lawrence.

That divine virtue which leads Christians to love God for His own sake, and to love the neighbor for the love of God, had no parallel in the ancient religions of the world, nor has it in any of the systems of modern society outside of Christianity. Philanthropy, on the other hand and in contrast with Christian charity, is a human sentiment, springing from natural motives. Humanity, rather than religion, is its motive power. Man is its object rather than God; the body, rather than the soul; time rather than eternity. Philanthropy springs from that repugnance which man feels towards human sufferings. Charity is a supernatural virtue; philanthropy is a human sentiment, not aspiring to, or reaching the elevation of a supernatural virtue. At most it is but a human virtue. Charity is always consistent with itself and with its divine origin. Philanthropy is good in the natural order, but its aims are earthly; its means are sometimes rash and faulty. Sometimes unjust in its measures, occasionally tyrannical in the exercise of power, and is liable to prove barren of results. But philanthropy, guided by experience, justice, and reason, is capable of achieving good and great results. Philanthropy is not inconsistent with the divine virtue of charity and, when yielding to the guidance of supernatural motives and seeking its purpose in God, may rise to the elevation of charity. But left to itself its aims are human, and when wholly divorced from religion and from the supernatural, it makes a religion of humanitarianism. It is not without its rewards, but its rewards are temporal. When guided in the individual by a pure and gentle benevolence and uprightness, and in the State by an enlightened statesmanship and even justice, it becomes an aid to true charity and a handmaid to religion. It is also capable of hostility to religion by not only ignoring it, but even by openly excluding or rejecting it; and of this last phase of philanthropy, we shall have occasion to mention a signal example in this paper.

Stephen Girard, of Philadelphia, may be mentioned as a prominent example of philanthropists. He was the son of a seaman and followed the sea like his father. From a cabin boy he rose to be a master, then a ship owner. He married the daughter of a ship builder; but his marriage was an unhappy one; he applied for a

divorce, and his wife died finally, insane, in a public hospital. During the American Revolution his maritime ventures were suspended, and he then made money as the owner of a grocery and liquor store in Philadelphia and Mount Holly. Resuming his shipping business after the war, wealth poured into his lap. Real estate ventures in Philadelphia were the principal foundation of his great fortune, and during the negro insurrection in Hayti, two of his vessels were in one of the ports of the island and received on board large amounts of treasure from Haytien planters for safe keeping; the planters and their entire families were cut off in the insurrection, and Mr. Girard thus became the possessor of \$50,000. With his capital and his strict business principles, he became one of the wealthiest merchants in the city. During the dreadful and unprecedented scourge of the yellow fever in 1793, '97 and '98, he became a public benefactor; not confining himself to liberal donations of money for the relief of the sufferers, but he gave himself personally to the duties of physician and nurse, performing even the most disagreeable offices for the sick in the hospitals, and for two months took charge of the hospital on Bush Hill. He subsequently went into the banking business. He was a liberal contributor to public works, city improvements and the adornment of the city. He built many handsome buildings. Frugality and parsimoniousness, sternness and exactness in his methods, characterized his dealings; but his benefactions showed that avarice was wholly absent from his character. His virtues and good deeds in the natural order received their reward, and in the war of 1812, he was able to lend the United States government \$5,000,000. With his great wealth his appearance and dress were exceedingly plain; he was uneducated; he was a free-thinker, an admirer of Voltaire, Rousseau and their school, and he was fond of naming his ships after such infidels; he was destitute of religion. Notwithstanding his kindness to the sick and his public benefactions, his character and nature were not adorned with the virtue of Christian charity, for it was said of him that "he never had a friend." He died on December 26, 1831, worth a fortune of \$9,000,000. Bequeathing little to his relatives, he gave by his will legacies amounting to about a million of dollars to benevolent and public purposes and works. But the chief feature of his testamentary disposition was the founding of Girard College, for which purpose he gave the bulk of his estate amounting to several millions, for the benefit of orphans.

Being himself an unbeliever in religion, he took the most radical measures in his will to exclude it from Girard College. While inculcating benevolence, love of truth, sobriety, industry, and morality, the means by which he had himself attained such signal

success in the temporal order, he positively prohibited any ecclesiastic, missionary, or minister of any sect whatever from holding any connection with the college; and he went so far as to prohibit all such from admittance to its premises, even as visitors.

While willing to concede—and the concession is a liberal one—that the establishment of Girard College was an act of philanthropy, we cannot regard it as a charity. We agree with the eloquent and noble sentiments of Daniel Webster, in his great argument in the celebrated Girard Will case, in which the great American jurist and advocate said to the court: “And I maintain that, in any institution for the instruction of youth, where the authority of God is disowned, and the duties of Christianity derided and despised, and its ministers shut out from all participation in its proceedings, there can no more be charity, true charity, found to exist, than evil can spring out of the Bible, error out of truth, or hatred and animosity come forth from the bosom of perfect love. No, sir! No, sir! If charity denies its birth and parentage, if it turns infidel to the great doctrines of the Christian religion, if it turns unbeliever, it is no charity. There is no longer charity, either in a Christian sense or in the sense of jurisprudence, for it separates itself from the fountain of its own creation.”

The third motive we have mentioned for the establishment and maintenance of measures and institutions for the relief, care, protection, and reformation of the dependent and unfortunate classes of society, is the motive of public policy. This should be more appropriately called public duty. It is a motive or duty which applies to the public, to the state. And this duty is to be traced to the fundamental motives which lead men to form governments and to the duties thereby imposed upon all governments as inherent in their nature. And although these motives and duties may be predicated of all governments, whatever their forms or constitutions, we Americans may be pardoned for regarding the republic as the model form of government, and to draw our illustrations therefrom. Not only are the United States a republic, but they are bound by the Constitution to guarantee the republican form of government to every State in the Union. Hence, what we now say as to the objects and motives of government, as based upon the Federal Union, will equally apply to all the States. These objects are clearly defined by the Constitution, and they are the same substantially in every State constitution.

“We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do or-

dain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

I quote from the Constitution of the great State of Pennsylvania :

"We, the representatives of the freemen of Pennsylvania, in general convention met, for the express purpose of framing such a government, confessing the goodness of the great Governor of the universe (who alone knows to what degree of earthly happiness mankind may attain by perfecting the arts of government) in permitting the people of this State, by common consent, and without violence, deliberately to form for themselves such just rules as they shall think best for governing their future society ; and being fully convinced that it is our indispensable duty to establish such original principles of government as will best promote the general happiness of the people of this State and their posterity, and provide for future improvements, without partiality for or prejudice against any particular class, sect, or denomination of men whatever, do, by virtue of the authority vested in us by our constituents, ordain, declare, and establish the following *Declaration of Rights and Frame of Government* to be the Constitution of this Commonwealth."

It is therefore the duty of every State to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and to secure liberty for the present and future generations. While many duties and the powers necessary for discharging them spring from these fundamental objects of government, conspicuous among them is the police power of the State governments ; a power which many judicial decisions of the courts have regarded as not among the powers surrendered by the States to the federal or general government, but as a power retained by the States and by the people of the States. The police power and the police duty are correlative and coextensive. And it is under these powers and duties that we see erected and maintained the public prisons, almshouses, hospitals, houses of correction, asylums for widows and orphans and the insane, reformatories, protectories, and the splendid array of public institutions which are the just pride of our States and leading cities. In the older countries of Europe these provisions for the general welfare have produced solid and ample prosperity under the accumulated endowments of centuries. Even in American cities, which are of comparatively recent foundation, so keenly have the governmental authorities been alive to those duties which the establishment of justice, the insurance of domestic tranquility, providing for the common defence, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing of the blessings of liberty as the inheritance of the Ameri-

can people, require at their hands that they have just cause for pride in the public institutions which adorn their great and spacious streets, avenues, and boulevards. Side by side with those noble institutions which Christian charity and human philanthropy have erected, stand the municipal establishments that public policy has impelled the State to erect and conduct.

For how, it might be asked, could this glorious Union be preserved unless the criminal classes are restrained and segregated in public prisons and unless the youths of the country are educated in institutions devoted to the inculcation of the duties of good citizenship, of patriotism, of morality, and of religion? How could domestic tranquility be insured, the common defence provided for, the general welfare promoted, and liberty secured, if poverty is left unprovided for and thus subjected to the temptations of crime and vice; if the unfortunate insane are allowed to roam at large to their own destruction and a danger to the lives and property of the community; if the infirm and sick are allowed to perish in our streets and the victims of contagious disease to mingle with the general population of our large cities; if juvenile delinquency is left unrestrained and unreformed to develop into matured and incorrigible criminality?

It would be a noble exhibit, if time and space permitted us to give a detailed account of what are popularly called the public charities of some of our great American cities. And while we do not regard as public charities those provisions of the public authorities for the performance of those duties enjoined by the inherent objects and purposes for which governments are formed—since they are more properly to be regarded as but the discharge of public obligations—yet they challenge our admiration by their noble purposes, by their generosity, by their public spirit, by the good which they accomplish, by the sufferings they assuage, by the crimes which they prevent, and by the blessings of union, liberty, and good government which they promote. It would be in our power to present the statistics of the public institutions of a single State of our Union which expends annually in works of beneficence and relief, of education and philanthropy, of public charities and correction, the munificent sum of over \$20,000,000, the State of New York. But we find ourselves in the midst of problems to be solved; of great moral, religious, constitutional, and social problems, which greatly concern the interests of the country in the objects and purposes for which governments are founded, the future interests of the republic, and the happy realization of the promises of religion for eternity.

In the midst of all these splendid works and labors of beneficence and love there is an appeal that comes up to us from the

agonies of society's throes—a voice eloquent with suffering, pathetic in its woe, irresistible in sympathy and justice. It is the cry of the child, the voice of helplessness, the appeal of innocence or of nascent and irresponsible delinquency; as “the child is father of the man,” so this touching appeal is the voice of future citizenship, of which the child of the day is the archetype. The solution of social problems growing out of the status of adults is not so difficult, and yet the principles of the rights of conscience which we will discuss apply with almost equal force to all human beings held in custody or imprisonment under the varied methods in which the police power of governments may be administered or applied. Apart from those positive and affirmative powers and duties which aim at securing the blessings of good government under our republican governments, that other power, the negative, or preventive and corrective, the protective and reformatory power—the police power—is held, by judicial decisions, to extend to and embrace all matters necessary to protect the public health, the public morals and the public safety. Its very nature and necessities show how indefinite, how vast, how elastic, how unique and exceptional the police power of the State must be, and, consequently, how fearful, how dangerous, how mysterious, how like the inexorable hand of war! How necessary it is, then, above all things, while securing the safety of the State, to respect the natural and inalienable rights and liberties of the citizen! Protection and reformation are among the highest and deepest problems of the police power of the State. This power can only be exercised with performance of a duty—the duties of the State; and what duties of the state are more sacred than those which the State owes to the child? Hence the cry of the child reaches the heart of Christendom, arouses the best sentiments of humanity, gives energy and vitality to philanthropy, and arouses the most heroic love and self-sacrifice of charity. It calls forth the best exertion of the energies of the public policy of the State in the discharge of those duties which her organic law imposes upon her.

The problem of the child presents itself with the most embarrassing circumstances of numbers, means and methods in our large cities. So appalling is the task that the combined efforts of religion, philanthropy and public policy are unequal to a complete performance of it. We who have made a study of the child problem have estimated that there are now over twenty-two millions of children in the United States. Of these, at least one-half, or eleven millions, are in the larger cities. And of these eleven millions one-tenth at least, or one million one hundred thousand, are in such circumstances or environment as need the aid or intervention of

charity or philanthropy or public policy. In the single State of New York there are over thirty thousand children who come under the classification of dependent, juvenile offenders or reformatory prisoners. With an array of public and private charities not equalled in any State in the Union, and not surpassed by those of any nation in the world, there were, in 1893, as many as eighty thousand five hundred and forty-three, to which we must add ten thousand inmates of prisons, penitentiaries and jails and the increase of the last two years, and this will make the whole number of persons who are a charge, in some form or other, upon that State amount to about one hundred thousand. A distinguished lawyer and friend of the child, Mr. Joseph H. Choate, said in the New York Constitutional Convention, of which he was president, in 1894: "Now, Mr. Lautenbach gave us a figure which is the starting-point, and a terrible figure it is. In the city of New York to-day, with eighteen hundred thousand people, there are eighteen thousand children dependent upon charity for support. For every hundred people in the city of New York there is a child dependent upon public charity—a most pitiable story!" We have before us now, in preparing this paper, the official reports of other States and cities, and they show that while New York has more than its share, in consequence of its immense immigrant population and its tenement houses, there is a "pitiable story" that could be told of other States and cities. But a volume, much less a single paper, could not suffice to tell the story. The large cities of other countries show similar statistics in this particular, and the struggle to meet this emergency, and to solve the child problem, is confined to no nation, clime or hemisphere; it is universal.

The duty of the State in solving this momentous problem is a civil duty. To see that the dependent young are so trained as to make good citizens is a brief and simple way of stating the duty of the state. The state is bound to see that proper care is taken to promote good health and robust constitutions, that they receive a proper education, that their morals are well guarded, and that religion, the most essential part of the education of the young and the most important element in the life and character of a nation and of its citizens, should be fostered, protected and guaranteed.

We know, both from divine precepts and from experience, that religion is an essential part of education, that it is the most essential part, and that it is the foundation of all education. The consensus of all nations and peoples establish this principle. We need not quote, on this head, from the Old and New Testaments of the Bible to prove that religion is essential to all nations and for all men, especially for the young, and that there is no education, in

the proper sense of the word, without religion. The sages of every land and the expounders of every creed have maintained this great principle. In remote antiquity Confucius enjoined this duty upon the great Oriental peoples that followed his teachings. So, too, in the Ordinances of Menu, claiming an antiquity greater than the Books of Moses, there is scarcely one of its twelve books, or one of its twenty-five hundred sections, that does not inculcate religion as the first and best instruction. Zoroaster, the great teacher and legislator of the Persians, inculcated this principle throughout the Avesta, their most sacred of books, and the Hebrew Talmud, as is shown by either the Palestrianian or Babylonian compendium, places above all other requirements of education the precepts of religion. Mahomet, in the Koran, makes religion the beginning and the end of all things.

In Pagan Greece and Rome the sages upheld the pre-eminence of religion in education. Plato, the great expounder of Grecian civilization and polity, addressed these burning words of wisdom to the republics of every land and age and to our own: "Ignorance of the true God is the greatest pest of all republics; therefore whoever destroys religion destroys the foundation of all human society." And the polished orator and statesman of ancient Rome maintained that "It is necessary that the citizens should be first persuaded of the existence of the gods, the directors and rulers of all things, in whose hands are all events, who are ever conferring on mankind immense benefits, who search the heart of man, who see his actions, the spirit of piety which he carries into the practice of religion, and who distinguish the life of the pious man from that of the ungodly man." And Seneca, the great inculcator of morals, said: "The first thing is the worship of the gods and faith in their existence; we are next to acknowledge their majesty, and bounty, without which there is no majesty."

During the long period of the first sixteen centuries of the Christian era when, as under the government of God's chosen people, the form of government might be likened almost to a theocracy, religion was the pre-eminent element and the controlling force in education. It was from religion that the great universities of Europe sprang, and it was by religion that they were chiefly inspired and directed. But we propose to cite only non-Catholic authorities in support of this great principle.

Even after the "Reformation," when the convents and monasteries, those ancient and venerable seats of secular and religious education, were abolished by the statute of 1st Edward VI., chapter 14, the very funds raised by the confiscation and sale of the religious institutions of old were directed to be applied to the founding of grammar-schools, and the statute provides for the re-

ligious instruction of youth. In the case of the *Bedford Charity*, reported in 2d Swanston's Reports, at page 529, Lord Eldon, in his elaborate opinion, states that in those grammar-schools the utmost care was taken for the education of the pupils in the Christian religion.

And here let us ask what such authority could be more esteemed, venerated and followed than that of George Washington, the father of our country? In his farewell address, Washington addressed to every American citizen for all time the following language: "Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion; whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

The following additional passages from the great argument of Daniel Webster that ablest and most eloquent expounder of the American constitution and of true Americanism, will go far to sustain our contention that religion is an essential part of the education of the young. In the celebrated Girard will case, Mr. Webster, among other sublime words, said: "The ground taken is that religion is not necessary to morality; that benevolence may be inculcated by habit, and that all the virtues may flourish and be safely left to the chance of flourishing without touching the waters of the living spring of religious responsibility. With him who thinks thus what can be the value of the Christian revelation? So the Christian world has not thought; for by that Christian world, throughout its broadest extent, it has been, and is, held as a fundamental truth that religion is the only solid basis of morals, and that moral instruction not resting on this basis is only a building upon sand. And at what age of the Christian era have those who professed to teach the Christian religion, or to believe in its authority and importance, not insisted on the absolute necessity of inculcating its principles upon the minds of the young? In what age, by what sect, when, where, by whom, has religious truth been excluded from the education of the young? Nowhere, never; everywhere, and at all times, it has been, and is, regarded as essential. It is of the essence, the vitality, of useful instruction. . . . The earliest and the most urgent intellectual want of human nature is the knowledge of its origin, its duty and its destiny. 'Whence am I, what am I, and what is before me?' This is the cry of the human soul so soon as it raises its contemplation above visible, material things." In this great forensic effort Mr. Webster made an overpowering burst of eloquence on those beautiful words of our Saviour, "Suffer little children to come unto me."

Eminent among the countless opinions we now have at our pen, and which are too numerous to be quoted here, on the necessity of religion in education, is that of the distinguished philanthropist and Christian, Elbridge T. Gerry, the indefatigable president of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, of whom it has been well said that he "is an example of a very rich man who is not content with drawing his check for benevolent or charitable purposes, but who devotes himself to those subjects in New York; who can be found before any of us are up in the city of New York at the Tombs or elsewhere looking after poor people, whether delinquents or otherwise." Mr. Gerry said before the New York State Charities Aid Organization, in 1893: "An institution is the best place for a child who has not a home. There is nothing which will compensate for the loss of home under the natural home influences and surroundings—the influence of the family life, of the family circle and family religion. And where the child, from accident or from any fault of its parents, or from the nature of its surroundings, is deprived of this home influence, it is necessary that some place should be provided for it to prevent its growth in evil practices and eventually ending in vice; and very often the very best effects have resulted from placing such child in an institution. In the growth of children the first place should be given to religion, and that training should be on the lines of parental faith; second, proper education, without which you can hope for nothing in ensuing work."

Mr. Erastus Brooks, who in his lifetime was an uncompromising opponent of the Catholic Church, a distinguished member of the New York Constitutional Convention of 1867, the editor of the New York *Evening Express*, and the antagonist of Archbishop Hughes in a famous controversy on ecclesiastical properties in 1853, says: "The State ought not to support the churches, and it ought not to make donations for purely sectarian purposes. And having answered this question, let me add that it is also unworthy of a State to deny any class of needy people the State's aid because the recipient of its bounty, perchance, belongs to any sect or to no sect; and I may also add that it is also unworthy of taxpayers and all others to incite the fury of the State against any sect or party on account of its religious faith. . . . Yet, while discarding State and Church as combinations, we must remember that there can be no true charity where all religion is excluded, since a pure charity is the very essence of practical Christianity, though no necessary part of what in the State is called 'a religious establishment.' Each member of a family, and every family, are a part of the State, whether rich or poor. The petitioners to this body seem to regard Roman Catholics solely in the light of

sectarians, and in this they err, just as the people in England erred when, in the reign of King Charles, they declared that dissent from the Catholic Church was sectarianism. Men may be Roman Catholics and something more. I lay it down as an axiom, sir, for which there is the highest authority, that to enforce human duties by divine obligation is not sectarian.

"I admit, sir, again and again, that sectarianism cannot be, must not be, supported by the State; nor must it, sir, if presented in the form of a true charity, be disowned by the State. Charity, which St. Paul makes the chief good, is scattered all over the Bible. It beams and shines there like the sun by day and the moon and stars by night. It is the very essence of the Christian religion, and therefore, in a civilized country cannot be excluded, in precept or practice, from any public or private institution. Again, sir, if you strike at one mode of religious worship, you strike at all. Your blows fall everywhere, and prostrate all whom they reach. You must not suppose that asylums in New York, West Chester, Rochester, or Buffalo, can be assailed upon the score of sectarianism, or Romanism, if you please, and Protestant institutions, like the two State houses of refuge, the institutions for the deaf and dumb, the blind, the children's aid societies, Five-points mission, hospitals for those of mature years, and infant dependence, escape unscathed. All are so far Protestant as to have Protestant officers, Protestant boards of trustees and directors, and a general Protestant management and superintendence.

"This is true, sir, of all our main institutions, either criminal or for the maintenance of the poor. I have no fault to find with any of them; but be careful where you strike, or, like Samson, you may bring the whole temple at your feet, and destroy all in your zeal to prostrate those you dislike.

"To say that the State has nothing to do with religion makes it atheistical; and that education and charity form no part of its duties, makes it barbarian. To declare, also, that all State duties look only to the protection of individual property, or what are called the rights of society, makes it but little more than material. The State takes life, limb, time, as well as property and money, to maintain its power and supremacy. It makes war, fires towns and ships, incarcerates in dungeons, abridges liberty, and punishes whom the law declares worthy of punishment, and often without discrimination of right. Can it do all this, and do nothing to minister to the souls and bodies of those who are diseased, infirm, naked, and hungry.

"And, first, of the nice distinction between charity in a State or legal sense, and in the sense in which it is a private benevolence. It is said that it is not right to tax the people for charity; but this

depends upon contingencies. If the charity is of a public nature, the tax paid for it is right. If partly public and partly private, the tax is right to the extent of the aid for public purposes."

From among the countless similar opinions before us, we will select that of a distinguished Hebrew advocate, Mr. Myer Stern, who ably supported the views of his confrere, Mr. Edward Lauterbach, in the New York Constitutional Convention in 1894, and said:

"Woe unto the day, gentlemen, that religion is interjected into our politics; and woe unto the men, who, in their pretended desire to separate Church and State, stir up the terrible fire of religious hatred. I believe in the most absolute separation of Church and State, and so do all patriotic Americans; but I believe, also, that the State has a duty to perform to the community by taking hold of the children who are penniless, or those who are worse than penniless. This duty, mind you, is not alone to these children, who must be led into the path of virtue and honor, but to the community, which must be protected against their becoming future charges upon the public, either as criminals or shiftless beings unfitted for the world.

"I do not suppose there is any difference of opinion on this question at all; if there is any, let those who entertain it think for a moment, what rich material there is for future criminals in the 18,000 children who are maintained in New York institutions to-day. Taken from the very dregs of society, they are brought into new environments, and under sweeter influences; but imagine what would have become of them otherwise?"

But, as we have quoted from pagan authorities of ancient Greece and Rome, we will conclude this branch of our subject with quotations from Thomas Henry Huxley, the naturalist, and Herbert Spencer, the evolutionist, who cannot be suspected of aiding the cause of Christianity, but were representatives of modern advanced thought, and who derided the idea that secular education alone was sufficient.

Mr. Huxley, in one of his "Lay Sermons," said: "I protest that, if I thought the alternative was a necessary one, I would rather the children of the poor should grow up ignorant of both these mighty arts—reading and writing—than that they should remain ignorant of that knowledge to which these arts are means."

Mr. Spencer, in his "Sociology," says: "Are not fraudulent bankrupts educated people—the getters-up of bubble companies, the makers of adulterated goods; the users of false trade-marks, and retailers who have light weights, and owners of unseaworthy ships, and those who cheat insurance companies, and those who carry on turf chicanery, and the great majority of gamblers? Or,

to take a more extreme form of turpitude, is there not among those who have committed murder by poison, a considerable number of the educated—a number bearing as large a ratio to the educated classes as does the total number of murderers to the total population? This belief in the moralizing effect of intellectual culture, flatly contradicted by facts, is absurd, *a priori*."

But there is another great principle, a fundamental legal truth, which claims the careful consideration, profound study and honest application of American statesmen in the solution of that important and inevitable problem of the child. It is a clear, settled and well defined principle of English and American law that the Christian religion forms a part of the common law of the land. Numerous judicial decisions, both in England and America, announce this important principle. Lord Hale, in 1 Vernon's Reports, page 293, said that to decry the Christian religion tended to destroy all religion, and decided that the Christian religion was part of the common law of the land. Dane's Abridgment, chapter 219, recognizes the Christian religion as a part of the common law. In the case of *King v. Wilson*, reported in 2 Strange's Reports, page 834, the judges regarded writing against religion as an offence at common law, and they refused to allow this question to be argued. The same principle of the common law was laid down in the case of *Evans v. The Chamberlain of London*, 2 Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, page 95; Taylor's case, in 2 Merivale's Reports, page 405; *The Attorney-General v. The Earl of Mansfield*, in 2 Russell's Reports, page 501; and in *The Attorney-General v. Cullun*, in 1 Young and Collyer's Reports, page 411. In this last case the syllabus of the decision is thus given by the reporter: "*The Courts of Equity in this country (England), will not sanction any system of education in which religion is not included.*"

Among American decisions to the same effect, the case of *Lindenmuller v. The People of the State of New York*, which is reported in 33 Barbour's Reports, page 561, is a leading one. In this case the Supreme Court of New York said: "It is not disputed that Christianity is a part of the common law of England, and in *Rex v. Woolston*, the Court of King's Bench would not suffer it to be debated, whether to write against Christianity in general was not an offence punishable in the temporal courts at common law. The common law, as it was enforced on the 20th day of April, 1777, subject to such alterations as have been made from time to time by the Legislature, and except such parts of it as are repugnant to the Constitution is, and ever has been, a part of the law of the State of New York." And the Court cited *Constitutions of 1846*, Article I., Section 17; of 1821, Article VII., Section 13; and of 1777, Section 25. The following passage from the elabor-

ate decision of the Court will be read with interest. "It would be strange that a people, Christian in doctrine and worship, many of whom, and whose forefathers had sought these shores for the privilege of worshipping God in simplicity and purity of faith, and who regarded religion as the basis of their civil liberty, and the foundation of their rights, should, in their zeal to secure to all the freedom of conscience which they valued so highly, solemnly repudiate and put beyond the pale of law the religion which was dear to them as life, and dethrone the God who they openly and devotedly professed to believe, had been their protector and guide as a people. Unless they were hypocrites, which will hardly be charged, they would not have dared, even if their conscience would have suffered them to do so. Religious tolerance is entirely consistent with a recognized religion. Christianity may be conceded to be the established religion to the qualified extent mentioned, while perfect civil and political equality, with freedom of conscience and religious preference are secured to individuals of every other creed and profession."

In the same State of New York, the same principle was held in the case of *People v. Ruggles*, reported in 8 Johnston's Reports, page 291, wherein Chief Justice Kent said: "That to revile the religion professed by almost the whole community, is an abuse of the right of religious opinion and free discussion secured by the Constitution, and that the Constitution does not secure the same regard to the religion of Mahomet, or of the Grand Llama, as to that of our Saviour, for the plain reason that *we are a Christian people*, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity." . . . And again the same distinguished judge said that the New York State Constitution "will be fully satisfied by a free and universal toleration, without any of the tests, disabilities or discriminations incident to a religious establishment. To construe it as breaking down the common law barriers against licentiousness, wanton and impious attacks upon Christianity itself, would be an enormous perversion of its meaning."

In the case of *Lindenmuller v. The People of New York*, the Court alluded to the fact that the people of the old thirteen States of the Union had exiled themselves from their mother country and founded their homes and their commonwealths on these shores for the express purpose of enjoying their religion; the case of Maryland is a signal example of this important historical fact. From the foundation of that colony the observance of the religious worship of Catholic Christianity, and the most perfect toleration and equality before the law went hand in hand together. In the April number of this REVIEW the present writer gave the celebrated Toleration Act of that colony, entitled "An Act Concerning Religion," which begins

with the recital, "Forasmuch as in a well-governed and Christian commonwealth matters concerning religion and the honor of our God, ought, in the first place, to be taken into serious consideration, and endeavored to be settled." The Act, which was enacted in 1649, then creates as offences against the law, and imposes punishments for uttering reproachful words against our Saviour or the Holy Trinity, or the Blessed Virgin Mary, or the Holy Apostles, the calling of others by such names as "Heretick, Schismatic, Idolator, Puritan, Presbyterian, Independent, Popish Priest, Jesuit, Jesuited Papist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antimormon, Barronist, Roundhead, Separatist," or other such term; for profaning the Sabbath, or for holding angry disputes on religion or creeds.

In the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in the case of *Updegraph v. Commonwealth*, reported in 11 Sergent and Rawle's Reports, page 394, and in the case of *Show v. The State of Alabama*, reported in 5 England's Reports, page 259, the Christian religion was recognized as a part of the Common Law. The important case of *Vidal v. Girard's Executors*, reported an appeal in 2 Howard's U. S. Supreme Court Reports, page 127, in the Supreme Court of the United States the question as to whether the Christian religion is a part of the Common Law was discussed, and that highest of American Courts held that it is. Judge Story, in delivering the opinion of the Court said: "So that we are compelled to admit, that although Christianity be a part of the Common Law of the State (of Pennsylvania), yet it is so in this qualified sense, that its divine origin and truth are admitted, and therefore, it is not to be maliciously and openly reviled and blasphemed against, to the annoyance of believers or the injury of the public."

In every State of the Union religious liberty is secured in the several constitutions among the inalienable rights of the people, just as the same sacred right is imbedded in the Constitution of the United States. The language of the Constitution of Pennsylvania is as follows: "Section 3. All men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship."

It has been pointed out in the course of this article that the Christian religion forms part of the Common Law. The American Constitutions, without exception, guarantee freedom of con-

science and absolute religious liberty to all. Does it not follow that all religious denominations thus safe-guarded in these fundamental bodies of laws are the joint protectors with the State, each of its own fellow-worshippers who are in need of that aid which public duty and private charity equally owe to helpless childhood, indigence, disease, vagrancy, vice and ignorance? Public policy and police regulation impose a duty on the State. Divine charity inflames the Christian heart to supplement the work of government with the alms-deeds of private benevolence. Of all the forms of human misery that of little children roaming the streets of great cities, ignorant, poverty-stricken and eddying with a current beyond their power to resist into the vortex of crime, is surely the most pitiable and appalling spectacle that menaces society to-day. "What is to become," exclaims Archbishop Ryan, "of the great number who have fallen away, in various degrees, from the paths of rectitude? These boys have much that is good left in them. They have the faith which can renew within their young hearts the first salutary impressions of their Christian homes. 'There is an angel imprisoned in that rough block of marble,' said Michael Angelo, 'and I shall liberate the angel,' and with his artistic chisel he brought out the imprisoned angel until it seemed as if prepared to join its celestial companions." With these vivid words the Most Reverend Archbishop makes his appeal for the new Catholic protectory for boys in Philadelphia. It is a grand idea, full of promise and fraught with incalculable blessings to the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania.

The drastic provisions of the State Constitution against State charities for denominational purposes would seem at first to admonish us in the outset that the scheme of a protectory, inception and realization, must be our own unaided, Catholic work. Thus the grand enterprise of Archbishop Hughes was launched on its auspicious voyage in New York which, as Burke said of the philanthropy of Howard, was to prove "a circumnavigation of charity." The lines are beaten out for Philadelphia in the history of its New York precursor, and are legible in every page of its thirty odd annual reports. The Constitution of Pennsylvania bids Catholics look to themselves alone, and with a cheerful alacrity let us set about the business in hand. Section 17 of that instrument reads as follows: "No appropriation shall be made to any charitable or educational institution not under the absolute control of the Commonwealth, other than normal schools established by law for the professional training of teachers for the public schools of the State, except by a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house." Section 18 is coached in the following language: "No appropriations, except for pensions or gratuities

for military services, shall be made for charitable, educational, or benevolent purposes, to any person or community, nor to any denominational or sectarian institution, corporation, or association."

The prohibition is impartial. We have seen in Sec. 3 of the Pennsylvania State Constitution, already quoted, that "no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship." After enumerating the institutions established by unaided Catholic piety and benevolence, Archbishop Ryan with just pride recalls the fact to the Catholics of the diocese: "And all this you have done without one cent's appropriation from the State." A grander movement, a protectory all embracing in its charity to the "little children" of Christ, now impends, and the appeal for its establishment has been made.

If we seek for a model system for the performance of this noble duty, it is to be found directly at hand in the great New York institution. No feature of proselytism, as we have already asserted, is found in the New York Protectory. "Long will the scene be remembered," says the Fourth Annual Report of the latter institution, page 105, "in which, as our claim for an appropriation before a committee of the Legislature was bitterly assailed on sectarian grounds, an eminent Protestant lawyer arose and eloquently said, in reply: 'Gentlemen, I think I am speaking for the whole bench of judges in the city of New York, while I affirm that if the existence of the institution under the Society for the Protection of Destitute Roman Catholic Children in that city has no other claim upon us, it certainly deserves our regard and support for *one blessing* it has achieved; and *that is*, the removal from our courts of the cause of incessant litigation between parents and proselyters as to the legal disposition of poor children.'"

As rigorous as seems the constitutional prohibition in Pennsylvania against denominational or sectarian appropriations, whether for charity or education, it is nevertheless allowed by law to the State authorities to put children under their control out at board, and the expense becomes a State charge for such subsistence. The board bills are paid by the public; and private benevolence here steps in, as in the case of the New York Catholic Protectory, and does the rest. By Act of the Pennsylvania Assembly of June 13, 1883, the Philadelphia Department of Charities and Correction is allowed so to board the children under its custody, and we find in ex-Mayor Stuart's Annual Message and accompanying documents for the year 1893, among the children so put out at boarding, forty-one were sent to Catholic institutions, and eighteen of the number remained in those institutions at the close of that year. Ex-Mayor Stuart adverts to a significant fact in this connection. "Your particular attention is called to the fact that throughout

the entire year in both Bureaus of this department (Charities and Correction), there was a greatly increased population receiving its care, there being an increase of one hundred and thirty-seven in the average daily population in the Bureau of Charities, and of seventy-six in the average daily population of the Bureau of Correction, yet there was a decrease in the daily *per capita* cost for subsistence in both bureaus" (page 23, Annual Message). Thus is made apparent the efficacy and economy of denominational work. The poor-house and work-house are no places for children. The civic duty which supplies them should become the enlarged statesmanship to supplement them by private institutions. Private charity does this work for the State far better, and, as ex-Mayor Stuart says, at a decreased cost. Investigation will show that there is nothing in the constitution and laws of Pennsylvania to prevent the State or the city from paying for services rendered to the public in the care of its waifs, which is nothing more than discharging the public duty in the most convenient and efficient manner. The model system of performing this public duty is that of the State of New York, where, by law, all children committed by magistrates must be committed to "institutions governed by persons of the same religious faith as the parents of such child." What is there to prevent the same being done in Pennsylvania? Mayor Stuart's report shows that it is practically being done now.

Here is a letter from one of the most experienced and practical philanthropists of our times, Mr. Elbridge T. Gerry, President of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, a gentleman who is not a Catholic, but, one whose opinions are formed from the widest sphere of activity and knowledge in the management of helpless childhood. We commend it to the study of wise statesmen and law-makers as the voice of one of America's wisest philanthropists.

THE NEW YORK SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO CHILDREN.

NEW YORK, May 20, 1895.

RICHARD H. CLARKE, ESQ.

My Dear Sir: In reply to your letter of May 17th, I proceed to answer your inquiries as follows:

So far from having had any reason to change my opinion in relation to the New York Catholic Protectory from that expressed by me in my argument before the late Constitutional Convention, I avail myself of this opportunity to reaffirm my belief that the policy of the people of this State requires that destitute children, so far as practicable, shall be trained and brought up in institutions conducted in the interests of the faith of their parents; and that this principle is not only a wise and salutary one, but absolutely essential to the future success of the child in life.

I regard religion as an essential part of the education of children. Unless a firm religious faith is instilled in the child at an early age, but little can be done to insure its proper growth in those lines of life which alone result in the formation of reputable

citizens and maintain the personnel of the people, who are the sovereigns of this great nation. Deprive a child of religion, and you deprive it of every incentive to this end. Leave a child simply to the inculcation of the ordinary tenets of science, and soon its belief is overturned, its disposition becomes wayward and feeble, its mind does not grasp readily the very principles sought to be instilled into it, it pays but little attention to the past, is absorbed by the present, and cares nothing for the future. Without religion, the child is in the same condition in which it would be if placed in a boat, understanding nothing of the principles of navigation, without any one to guide it or any knowledge of its course. Shipwreck, sooner or later, is the inevitable result.

In my judgment it would be a most unwise thing for the State, under any circumstances, to deprive the denominational institutions of the care of destitute children, and especially of those children who, having been exposed to the contagion of vice, are suffering mentally and morally from the effects of that poison. Only the potent influences of religious teaching can eradicate the seeds of moral disease, and only long-continued training of the child can eviscerate the poison when it is once absorbed in the moral system. Unhappily, at times, this seems to be impossible, and yet oftentimes encouraging results are accomplished even with the most depraved and fallen. To question this, is to doubt the goodness of God. To maintain it, involves the upholding of the institutions. Facts always speak louder than words, and the records of child-saving work fully sustain my position in this respect.

Lastly, in reference to the Catholic Protectory, I know of no institution more thoroughly, economically, and faithfully conducted than the one in question. Its system is admirable. The child is not only trained in the principles of religion, but taught to earn its own living when it leaves the institution. The physical condition of the child is carefully cared for, the food and clothing are excellent, and, in my opinion, if the New York Catholic Protectory were duplicated in every city of the Union, a bulwark would thereby be established in favor of Catholic children, to shield them from the results oftentimes of the folly and crimes of others, from the consequences of which they would otherwise inevitably suffer. The secret of the success of the protectory is the magnificent system on which it is founded. The trouble with non-sectarian institutions is, that there is no unity of purpose, and the result is a non-cohesive system, sometimes producing beneficial results, but too often failing from the defect alluded to.

I have the honor to remain,

With great respect,

ELBRIDGE T. GERRY,

President, etc.

Of all the handmaids of the State for snatching brands from the burning, the New York Catholic Protectory may be singled out as chiefest and best. Public or State charities are an imperative duty of government. They are too often confounded by bigotry, with private benevolence and withheld under a false cry of sectarian attacks upon the State treasury. Public policy not only enjoins, but public duty requires that poverty and vice, and ignorance among the young should be arrested, and the fundamentals of reading and writing and of morality and religion should be inculcated as the mainstays of society against anarchy, and the primary duty of the American people as the safeguard of the Republic. Millions are spent to support criminals in prisons. Would not the money be better spent to prevent crime, and make the criminals good citizens? The charity is often mixed, partly private and

partly public. Wherever this is the case private institutions like the New York Catholic Protectory and the proposed Philadelphia Catholic Protectory, can do the work for the city and State more cheaply, more effectively, far better than public institutions. Such is the uniform experience wherever the two systems have come into competition. Never was this more perfectly shown than by Mr. George Bliss, of New York, in his argument before the committees of the Constitutional Convention of that State held last year. His thesis in part, was this: "The State hires societies to board and educate those whom it is itself bound to support somewhere, and pays to these societies and institutions less by nearly half than it could do the same work for in its own institutions, and less by a considerable sum than it costs those institutions in which that work is done, while the State gets them better cared for." And he proved it by an array of convincing arguments and figures.

The Hon. Henry Martyn Hoyt, the patriotic governor of Pennsylvania from 1878 to 1883, in one of his annual messages used burning words to convince the people that private benevolent institutions are better places for the juvenile waifs of the State than any public institutions can be. He said :

"From the State Board of Public Charities, from the official declarations made in the State Convention of Poor Directors, and from the testimony of interested citizens on all sides, comes a swelling protest against the longer continuance of the evil and disgrace attending the presence of children in our almshouses and poor-houses. In the past five years over three thousand children, under sixteen years' old, have been temporary or permanent residents of these institutions. These children, in a word, are enervated by idleness, corrupted in body and soul, without the possibility of acquiring or recovering their self respect, prepared for pauperism and crime, effectually wrecked at the outset of life. It would be gratifying if we had throughout the State more corporations of benevolent persons addressing themselves to this evil."

The other day appeared in the press a letter of Herbert Spencer expressive of the utmost irritation at a statement that certain European socialists and free-thinkers derived comfort for socialism from his writings. He regarded socialism, said the account, as the greatest curse of the century. If there be one duty more imperative than another, which public men in the United States owe to the people to-day, it is the duty to stem the rising tide of irreligion, at least by negative and co-operative action in conjunction with the various denominations of religious belief. The pagan element which has crept into the life of modern society, poisoning its literature, subverting or retarding the growth of Christianity and sub-

stituting the models of a godless philosophy for the wholesome lessons of the Gospel, must be eradicated, if the State is to be saved and our free institutions are to be preserved. Where is the point of vital attack, where that of defence, if it be not in the ranks of our children and in the proper treatment of the child problem in America? Let Church and State remain apart, moving forward in their great work in parallel lines, never converging, each bearing its own standards, and each willing and ready to allow the other to do its share of the mighty work, in bringing up the millions of a rising generation in the paths of rectitude, good citizenship, self-dependence and Christian morality. Thus and thus only may the Republic which Washington bequeathed to us be saved to the human race. Thus may the child problem be solved. Denominational institutions, each for the children of its own faith, are the only agencies fit to grapple with the difficulties that beset the problem, able to supplement mere civics with that heavenly spirit which spoke as we have it, through the lips of the Redeemer.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

Scientific Chronicle.

PRECIOUS STONES—GEMS—JEWELS.

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."—GRAY'S *Elegy*.

THE poet may possibly have known what he was chanting about, but had he not taken the trouble to proclaim the fact, we should certainly never have thought it possible to gather any large crop of flowers from the desert. Had he, besides, not spoken so very positively about it, we should also have remained in profound ignorance concerning the contents of the *dark*, and especially of the *unfathomed*, caves of the ocean. Yet we are grateful for the information, even at the hands of a poet. And nevertheless, the flowers that bloom in the desert, or anywhere else for that matter, have nothing to do with the article now in hand; but the gems "of purest ray serene," or otherwise, are the very subject-matter with which we intend to deal to-day. With this lucid preface we plunge immediately into business.

PRECIOUS STONES.

A "precious stone" is a mineral possessing the qualities of hardness, durability, and beauty of color, in such a degree as to render it suitable as an article of ornamentation. Strictly speaking, this concerns the material in itself, but the appreciation in which a stone may be held will depend, to a great extent, on its rarity also.

Under the broad definition just given would be included, besides what are usually considered as precious stones, the more ornamental kinds of building stones, as well as those that are used for statuary, such as the finer granites, marbles, serpentines, etc. In a more restricted sense, and the one in which we use it here, the definition includes only such minerals as are used for personal decoration, as in rings, charms, brooches, and the like, or for the ornamentation, and sometimes even manufacture, of articles for personal use, such as vases, cups, chalices, swords, pistols, candlesticks, etc. Judged by the standards of hardness, durability, beauty of color, and adaptability to personal ornamentation, the only really precious stones are the diamond, the ruby, the sapphire, and the emerald.

But there is a large family of minerals, almost perfectly durable, and fairly beautiful, which, though not so hard as the ones just named, are yet hard enough to scratch the hardest glass; for example, opal, tourquoise, tourmaline, garnet, hyacinth, and others. These are classed as

"semi-precious," though in the appreciation in which they have at times been held, another law comes into play which has often raised one or other of them almost to the rank of the diamond itself. This is the law of the "fad." We shall meet with instances of the operation of this law later on.

GEMS.

A "gem" is a precious, or semi-precious, stone which has been cut and polished for ornamental purposes. The cutting may have been done merely with the object of getting rid of defective parts, and of producing such angles and surfaces as will best reflect and refract the light which falls upon the stone, as will be explained more fully further on. On the other hand, the cutting may be a true engraving, in which letters, and artistic, or what are intended to be artistic, figures are produced. If the engraved portion is in relief (standing out), the gem is called a *cameo*; if the engraving is sunken into the stone, it is called an *intaglio*. Cameos are employed as ornaments only, but intaglios are generally intended to be used as seals, and hence in them, all lettering must be reversed. In the days when kings spent most of their time in the noble art of fighting, and had little or none left to waste on such minor matters as learning to write, an intaglio, bearing the sovereign's name or initials, or coat-of-arms, or other figure chosen according to some whim or fancy, was set in a finger-ring. By means of it he stamped his signature, or what served as such, in wax, on any document that needed his authority, from the deed of sale of a goose and gander to the order to behead an innocent fellow-man. This was the monarch's signet-ring.

JEWELS.

A "jewel," properly speaking, is a precious stone, cut, polished, and set in its mounting, or, more briefly, a mounted gem. The name is however sometimes, though very improperly, applied to ornaments of gold, silver, or other metals. With these we have nothing to do, at least at present. Like every other decent word it is also frequently used in one or more metaphorical senses, but we must draw the line here.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PRECIOUS STONES.

In order to make matters clearer, and at the same time to avoid tedious repetitions, we give here the chief distinguishing characters of the precious stones.

I. *Hardness*.—In common language this term is often used as synonymous with strength, or "difficulty of breakage." This is not its true meaning however, either in mineralogy or morals. It really means the resistance a body offers to being scratched. A substance which can be made to scratch another is said to be the harder of the two. Thus, a crystal of quartz will scratch steel, and is therefore harder than steel, though it is not nearly so strong, and can be broken much more easily. For the purpose of comparing the hardness of different minerals, the German chemist, Mohs, chose the following substances as standards in

constructing his "scale of hardness." The list is arranged in such a way that each mineral in it may be scratched by any one below it, and will scratch any one above itself.

1. Talc or Soapstone. (It is easily scratched by the thumb-nail.)
2. Compact Gypsum, or, Rock Salt. (About equally hard.)
3. Calc spar. (Any cleavable variety.)
4. Fluor Spar.
5. Apatite. (A compound of Calcium phosphate and fluoride.)
6. Feldspar. (Any cleavable variety.)
7. Quartz. (The limpid kind.)
8. Topaz.
9. Sapphire, or Corundum.
10. Diamond. (The hardest of all known substances.)

To estimate the hardness of a mineral, try it by the minerals of this list. For example, if a substance neither scratches nor is scratched by Quartz, we call its hardness 7. If it scratches Quartz and is scratched by Topaz, we say its hardness is 7.5, and similarly in other cases. Scratching and cutting are altogether different things, for though many minerals will scratch glass, only the natural edge of the diamond will cut it.

"In direct proportion to the hardness of a mineral is its susceptibility of receiving and retaining a good polish, which is the principal cause of the superior brilliancy and beauty of jewels over all other natural ornaments worn as decorations," says Harry Emanuel, in his "Diamonds and Precious Stones." This quality of hardness also it is that preserves gems from the ravages of time. Nineveh and Babylon have crumbled into dust, and the pyramids of Egypt are slowly but surely wasting away, but the gems unearthed to-day are as fresh and perfect as they were when they were first formed, and dropped like stars from the hand of the Creator, ages ere Nineveh was dreamt of, and while Babylon was yet unborn.

II. *Lustre*.—By this term is meant the peculiar brilliancy which the polished gem possesses. It depends, probably, upon the molecular structure of the stone, but is mainly a surface phenomenon. The different kinds of lustre have been classified as follows:

Adamantine: possessing the brilliancy of the diamond.

Vitreous: resembling the surface of polished glass.

Resinous: shining, like the freshly-exposed surface of resin.

Pearly: having the semi-iridescent appearance of pearl.

Silky: said of gems whose surface has, to a greater or less extent, the sheen of silk.

Metallic: most metals in the massive state, especially if polished, have, irrespective of their color, a lustre quite peculiar, and which is shared by many metallic compounds; but these are rarely used as gems.

Some other terms are occasionally employed, but these are the principal ones, and, after all, no description can really describe the lustre of a mineral, just as no one could make a blind man understand what is meant by "red," for example, or "green." Nothing but the normal

eyesight can give a correct idea of what is meant by lustre, and even then words fail to reproduce it, and the foregoing designations can only claim to be approximations.

III. *Color*.—The color of a gem plays a large part in the estimation of its beauty, but it affords no indication whatever of its nature or genuineness. The Ruby, the Spinnelle, and the Garnet are quite different chemically, and yet they are not unfrequently found of exactly the same color, and even of the same tint. On the other hand, the same mineral substance may have now one color now another, and indeed its name in commerce often depends upon what that color happens to be. Thus crystallized oxide of Aluminum (Al_2O_3), when blue, is called Sapphire; when red, Ruby; and when yellow, Oriental Topaz; while Quartz takes on at least a dozen different names according to the color or tint of its crystals. These differences are usually ascribed to minute traces of metallic oxides in solution in the gems. Besides this, different parts of one and the same crystal may have different colors, as happens sometimes in the Oriental Sapphire, in which red, blue, and yellow, lie peacefully side by side. In some cases the color of a gem appears different according as you view it by reflected or by transmitted light, that is, according as you look *at* it, or look *through* it. Opal and Tourmaline afford instances of this phenomenon. It is also necessary to note that, in describing gems, the word "white" is often used where "colorless" is meant. It is an abuse that ought to be corrected, because it leads to confusion. If you say that pure water is "white," how are you going to designate the color of milk? And yet even a baby knows that they are not the same. Consistency is a jewel that ought to adorn the language of every one who speaks of gems.

IV. *Diaphaneity*.—We are obliged to use this cumbrous extract of Greek in this place because the handier Latin terms are needed just below. Most gems allow more or less light to pass through them, and "diaphaneity" is the word we employ to express that property. Its various degrees are the following:

Transparent: a term applied to a body through which objects can be distinctly seen.

Semi-transparent: when objects seen through it appear indistinct.

Translucent: when light indeed passes through, but objects cannot be distinguished.

Semi-translucent: when translucent at its edges only.

Opaque: when no light passes through.

The transitions are not however abrupt. The different conditions shade into each other by imperceptible degrees just as light and the day fade away gently into darkness and night, and just as gradually return at morning's dawn.

V. *Specific gravity*.—By this we mean the ratio which exists between the weight of a given substance and the weight of an equal volume of another substance arbitrarily chosen as the term or standard of comparison. As however this is rather too philosophical to be clear, let us try to clarify it a little by a concrete example. Suppose a given bulk of a substance, say gold,

weighs 242 grains, and that an equal bulk of distilled water at 32 degrees Fahrenheit weighs $12\frac{1}{2}$ grains. Then the relation between these weights will be as 242 to $12\frac{1}{2}$, or, by reducing, as 19.36 to 1. That 19.36 is called the specific gravity of gold. The specific gravity of gems is very much lower than this, ranging as it does from less than 2, to about 5 as a maximum. In some cases the specific gravity is a perfectly decisive test of the genuineness of a gem when most other characteristics would leave us in doubt; as, for example, to judge between the white sapphire and the diamond, the former always having the higher specific gravity. However, to determine the specific gravity of a substance as closely as needed for test-work, requires a delicate balance and the delicate hand of a chemist to manipulate it. Needless to say that a pair of hay-scales, with a ploughman behind them, would hardly be found to suit the purpose.

VI. *Refraction and Dispersion*.—An important property of all transparent substances, whether solid, liquid, or gaseous, is the power of refracting light. The meaning of this is that a ray of light on entering one of these substances in an oblique direction, instead of keeping straight on, is turned abruptly aside from its path. Its original line of direction has been *broken*, and hence the phenomenon is called *refraction*. If the ray emerges from the other side, and that side is in the proper position with respect to the first, the light, on passing out, will be still further turned aside from its original direction. The *total* amount of deviation depends, first, on the angle at which the light strikes the surface of the refracting substance, or medium as it is technically called; secondly, on the angle between the surfaces of entrance and emergence; and thirdly, on the nature of the medium itself. The *relative* refractive power depends solely on the nature of the medium, and is determined by what is called the "Index of Refraction." We cannot here enter into a detailed explanation of this point, but shall content ourselves, and we hope our readers likewise, by giving the bald definition: "The Index of Refraction is the ratio between the sine of the angle of incidence, and the sine of the angle of refraction." In any medium, a greater index of refraction means a greater refractive power.

Dispersion is a phenomenon which nearly always accompanies refraction. It consists in this, that when a ray of light is refracted, it is at the same time split up into its constituent colors, for, be it understood, color is light and nothing else. When white light, which is made up of all colors, suffers refraction in passing through a colorless medium, it is decomposed into its constituents, and hence gives us all of the simple or primary colors. An example of this may be seen in the bright bits of color produced by the glass pendants of the old-fashioned chandeliers of our grandmothers' days. How we used to revel in their beauty, as they dangled in the breeze, and sparkled in the glorious sunlight of those distant days! If however the light which falls upon the medium be monochromatic (one-colored), it cannot of course be decomposed, but this case will hardly occur in practice, for we generally

inspect our gems in the white sunlight, or at least in some artificial light which has some pretension to whiteness. Lastly, if the medium itself be colored, then only that color will pass through, and there will be refraction without decomposition, but there will be dispersion in the secondary sense that the colored ray will be somewhat broadened out. Thus, a piece of clear glass, or limpid rock crystal, of the proper shape, that of a triangular prism being the best, will decompose white light into its component colors, and let them pass through, but a colored prism will absorb and extinguish within itself every color except its own, and consequently only that will pass through.

The dispersive power is measured in this way. The angle between the least refracted and the most refracted color (the red and the violet), is called the *angle of dispersion*, and this angle, divided by mean angle of refraction of all the rays, gives the *dispersive power*. In the Table given below will be found the Refractive Index, and the Dispersive Power of the various gems.

VII. *Reflection* (internal).—The ordinary phenomenon of reflection is well known to everybody. It means that when light strikes a polished surface, a part at least of it is thrown back in such a way that the angle at which it glances off is the same as that under which it reached the polished surface. There is however one little point here that is not so well known, but which is of importance for the matter now in hand. We shall try to make it clear by an example. Suppose we had a mass of water perfectly clear and colorless, say the full of a cubical tank measuring ten feet each way. If now we hold an incandescent electric-light above the surface of the water, part of the light impinging on the surface of the water will be reflected from that surface, and the rest will penetrate the water and illuminate the sides and bottom of the tank. So far all is clear. But now let us lower the light deep into the water itself. Then, considering the light as the apex of an inverted cone whose base is at the surface of the water, and whose angle is 82 degrees and 50 minutes, all the light included within that cone will be separated into two parts, one of which will pass through the water, and out, while all the rest will be reflected back *internally*, to the bottom and sides of the tank. Of the light which strikes the surface outside of the base of the cone, no part will pass out, but it will all be reflected back into the tank. These internal reflections will therefore be either partial or total according to the angle at which the light reaches the surface from the inside. Such being the case, we are prepared to proceed to the next characteristic of gems, viz.:

VIII. *Fire*.—In order to become acquainted with the real significance of this word, we must beg, borrow, or get a gem; the best for the purpose would be perhaps a diamond, and all the better if it be colorless. It should have been properly cut. Now hold it up to the light. In striking the facets of the gem at different angles, part of the light will be refracted in one direction, and other parts in others. Moreover the different rays will be decomposed more or less completely into their primary colors; these will cross each other at different points, and then

partly pass on and through the crystal, and partly return by *internal* reflections, and crossing as before, will make the gem sparkle as "a thing of beauty and a joy forever." All this is due to refraction, dispersion, and reflection, and produces what is known as the "fire" of the gem. It is not the same as "lustre," though some careless writers have failed to note the distinction. It is plain that for the best effects the gem must be of the proper form, for even the diamond, if left rough, or if cut improperly, will have very little fire, while if cut just right, it surpasses in beauty every other known gem.

CUTTING.

In speaking of gems the word "cutting" is used in three different senses, viz.:

1. Cutting, technically so-called.
2. Splitting.
3. Sawing.

We have here in mind especially the case of the diamond, but whatever operations may be performed on the diamond can with yet greater facility be performed on other gems.

1. *Cutting*.—This means the abrasion or grinding down to the required surface rather than a true cutting in the ordinary sense of the word. It has frequently been stated that the art of cutting the diamond with its own powder, was discovered by Lewis Van Berghen, a Dutchman, in 1476, but Harry Emanuel mildly qualifies the statement as "somewhat inaccurate," since he finds instances of several diamonds that must, in his opinion, have been cut a hundred years earlier at least.

The instruments employed have varied considerably in the course of time, and vary also according to the nature of the gem to be cut. The process by which a piece of garnet may be fashioned might be wholly useless in the case of a ruby or diamond. To cut a diamond you must first get the diamond, or rather, you must get two of them. Then take two sticks, and, with jeweler's cement, fasten each gem into the end of a stick. Now take the sticks, one in each hand, and bring the exposed surfaces into contact. Then rub, and rub, and keep on rubbing, and don't give up, until those two surfaces are worn down flat and even. The flat surfaces so formed are called "facets." Next melt the cement, take out the diamonds, set them in again at exactly the right angle, and rub again as before; repeat the operation until you have formed the required number of facets, or rather the number that can be safely made by this first hand-process. Two or three times as many will be formed in the subsequent operation of polishing, of which more anon.

2. *Splitting*.—When, in order to bring the diamond to the required shape, a considerable portion has to be removed, recourse may be had to "splitting." This will save time and labor, and besides, "usable" pieces will sometimes be split off. To succeed in this operation however, you must have a thorough knowledge of the internal structure of the gem. You may have logic enough to argue a bull-terrier out of a

bone, but all your logic will fail ignominiously if you attempt to split a diamond "against the grain." Making however the rather wild supposition that you know just how the cleavage planes run, then, you may try your hand at splitting, but please, let us implore you, don't use a hatchet. Take the diamond and cement it strongly and deep in the end of a stout stick, leaving exposed that portion only which you intend to remove. Now with the natural edge of another diamond, make a scratch all around the base of this portion. But, to the critical mind, a doubt may arise here. If you can scratch one diamond with another, then which is the harder? Or, what becomes of the definition of "hardness?" But we need not be alarmed, for the natural edge of the diamond *is* slightly harder than the faces. Next deepen the scratch just made, as much as possible, with a fine splinter obtained from another diamond. Fix the cement-stick in a vise, insert the edge of a very hard, steel, knife in the scratch, and give it a smart blow on the back with a hammer. If the blow has been just right, and like a perfect beef-steak, neither overdone nor underdone, you will have made a clear split, saved a fragment of your diamond, and spared yourself a good deal of time and labor. But the chances are about even that you will botch it, and then you will lose both your labor and your pains, and probably spoil your diamond besides. In that case the only consolation we can offer you is: "Ah! We told you so," and then we feel taller by about three inches.

3. *Sawing*.—Diamonds may also be cut by sawing, but a buck-saw has not been found the most suitable tool for the purpose. If a fine iron wire be stretched in a hack-saw frame, and kept anointed with a paste of diamond powder and olive oil, and a very large dose of patience, one may work his way through the stone. This is a much safer process than splitting, and we recommend it to our readers.

FORMS OF GEMS.

The forms, or "cuts," given to gems are quite numerous. The best form to be given depends on the size, and shape, and perfection of the original crystal. Some of the names are: the Brilliant, the Brillionet, the Rose, the Table, the Pavilion, the Cabochon; there are even several varieties of each, but without diagrams it is totally impossible to give any idea of the meaning of these terms. Fortunately it is hardly necessary, as we take it for granted that most of our readers are perfectly familiar with the gems themselves. During the reign of Louis XIII. (1610-1643), Cardinal Mazarin first had diamonds cut in the form of brilliants, twelve of which were set in the crown of France, but several of them have since passed into the category of "lost, strayed, or . . . disappeared."

POLISHING.

The polishing of the diamond is done by means of a rapidly-rotating steel, or cast-iron, disk, called the "skaif." In order to hold the polishing powder of diamond-dust and olive oil, the skaif is grooved with fine lines in the direction of its radii. In primitive times, the skaif

was made to rotate by hand-power, and in India they do not seem to have got beyond this crude method even yet ; but horse, steam or electrical power is employed by most civilized lapidaries of the present day. In any case, the diamond, cemented to its stick, is pressed against the face of the anointed, rotating disk, and its position changed from time to time, till the form is correct and the polish perfect. It sometimes takes two or three years to finish up a single large gem. This operation of polishing may all seem simple enough, and probably it is so when there is question of the larger specimens, but when you come to the little ones, of which it sometimes takes more than 100,000 to weigh an ounce, it will be readily understood that very great skill and excellent eyesight are necessary.

ENGRAVING.

The art of engraving on gems in general, was known from the very earliest times. As we shall see later, frequent mention is made of them in the Bible, and specimens that have come down to us from ancient Egypt, Greece, Rome, and the "gorgeous East," are often of the most exquisite art and workmanship, unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled, by anything of more recent dates. C. W. King, in his magnificent work on "Antique Gems," says that the diamond furnishes no engravings of either ancient or modern artists. Yet, in another part of the same work, he accepts as a fact that Clemente Birago, a Milanese, in 1564, engraved on the diamond a portrait of Don Carlos, and also a seal of the Arms of Spain, and that Giovanni Costanzi, in 1750, at Rome, engraved in like manner a head of Nero for Vaini, while Carlo Costanzi succeeded in producing a Leda, and a head of Antinous for the king of Portugal. The two statements seem to be contradictory, but King probably means that these specimens are the only ones on record, and that even they are not now to be found. Others hold that these were only white sapphires.

The cutting, polishing, and engraving of gems, other than the diamond, offers comparatively little difficulty. It is accomplished by means of rotating disks, drills, and saws of steel or bronze, frequently almost microscopic in size, and armed when necessary with scraps of the diamond. Sometimes the work is done, at least in part, by means of diamond points set in handles, much after the manner in which our wood-engravers employ their tools of steel.

SETTING.

In order to preserve and properly display a gem, it requires to be mounted. In the East, especially in ancient days, and among the American Indians even later, gems were bored and assembled on a string. In our days, at least among civilized folks, a casing of gold, or silver, or bronze is used. For colorless gems, silver gives the best effect, for colored gems, gold is preferred. In the case of perfectly transparent gems, the mounting should clasp the stone at the edges only, so that it may be viewed by transmitted as well as by reflected

light. But when the gem is merely translucent, the back of the setting is closed, and is usually lined with foil of gold or silver, or else is colored to match the tint of the stone itself. This adds much to the brilliancy, and sometimes helps to disguise flaws and other imperfections, and hence a gem so mounted should never be bought till it has been taken out and carefully inspected. The beauty of a large stone may be much enhanced by surrounding it with smaller ones of different colors, but this does not yet come up to the brilliant idea of the lady who wanted to outrival all her rivals by having several "solitaires" set in the same mounting.

WEIGHT OF GEMS.

This is usually given in "carats." The carat is a red bean, the fruit of the "kuara," the so-called coral tree, and was formerly used for weighing gold dust. There is some discrepancy between the statements of different authors as to its true value. Feuchtwanger says it is equal to 4 grains, and that 44 carats are equal to one ounce. When a boy we imagined we knew some arithmetic, but in our old age we are obliged sorrowfully to confess that the latter half of the above statement has proved entirely too deep for us. The ounce Troy, and Troy-weight alone is used for gems, is 480 grains, but we have so far been unable to get 480 out of 4 times 44. We have tried the Rule of Three, and also Alligation, but they don't seem to work; some of the common arguments of Political Economy, however, come pretty near it. Another value given for the carat is 3.2 grains, but, according to G. F. Kuntz, the present international carat is 205 milligrams, or 3.168 grains nearly. The consequence of this tinkering with things once already tacitly agreed on, is that now when we read of a gem whose weight is given as, say 231 carats, we know as much about it as a hen does about the internal tonal possibilities of a fiddle-string.

CLASSIFICATION OF GEMS.

The ancients classified gems according to their colors; mineralogists nowadays arrange them according to their chemical composition; lapidaries look rather to their physical properties; others again write them down simply in alphabetical order. For our purpose the most satisfactory way probably is to arrange them in the order of their hardness, and then sub-classify according to color. This is the order of the following list which contains the principal precious stones. If carefully examined it will be found to contain a good deal of condensed information that may obviate the necessity of a large amount of dilute talk afterwards. In this Table the word "white" is used, out of deference to the masters in this branch, instead of the word "colorless."

THE INDIVIDUAL GEMS.

Diamond. —The name "diamond" is derived from the Greek word *adamas*, which means "invincible," and refers to the hardness of the stone. The Syrians are said to have been the first to know the diamond,

and in the early ages it was an article of commerce throughout all the East. The Etrurians procured diamonds in the interior of Africa, and sold them to the inhabitants of Carthage. Pliny mentions six species of what he calls diamonds, but later researches have proved that only the one from India was true, the others being merely quartz. The diamond, though worn in those times in the rough state, was highly prized, but rather on account of medicinal properties superstitiously attributed to it, than for its beauty.

Concerning the origin and nature of the gem, as well as of other precious stones, many wild ideas formerly prevailed. "Plato supposes that they are produced by the vivifying spirit abiding in the stars, which longing to form new things, converts the most vile and putrid matter into the most perfect objects. He describes the diamond as being found like a kernel in the gold, and supposes it to be the purest and noblest part, which had become condensed into a transparent mass." Theophrastus, the friend and disciple of Aristotle, speaks of the common belief of his time that some precious stones have the power of generating others, but he has sense enough to reject the fable. Pliny seems to reject it also, although it was firmly believed by his all-powerful patron, the Consul Mucianus. In later times it crops up again, for we find Ruæus relating that a lady of Heveren possessed two diamonds which *were seen* to bring forth others at certain fixed intervals. In India the belief is current to the present day, among the common people, that when a diamond mine has been exhausted, it will after the lapse of about twenty years be found as rich as ever in newly-grown precious stones. Still the splendors of old Golconda seem to be very slow in reviving.

The question of the composition of the diamond has been definitively settled only within the last hundred years, and we now know for certain that it is pure crystallized Carbon; but the mode of its formation is as profound a mystery to us as it was to the boys and girls who learned their letters from Cadmus. Of course there has all along been a good deal of speculating about it. Some have ascribed its formation to igneous action, by which the carbon was once melted; on cooling down, it naturally crystallized. A strong objection to this theory is that in the case of colored diamonds, and they are by far the more numerous, the coloring matter is in all probability an organic substance, and one which consequently could not stand the heat of fusion. Others have therefore supposed that just as we have plants to-day (the bamboo for example), which have the power of assimilating silex from the earth, and transforming it into the form of crystals of quartz, so there may have been in primitive times some plant, now extinct, which could not only assimilate carbon, as all plants indeed always do, but even crystallizes a part of it in the form of diamonds. Yet there is no certainty of this, and the conditions under which they are found do not seem to favor the theory. The final summing up is: "Nobody knows."

Where Found.—India was once the home of the diamond. It has moved its "Lares and Penates" several times since it was first discovered. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries as many as 60,000 persons,

Name and Color.	Hardness.	Lustre.	Diaphaneity.
DIAMOND. White, pink, yellow, red, blue, green, black, brown, orange, opalescent. BORT. CARBONATE (compact variety).	10	Adamantine with prismatic colors. None.	Transparent. Translucent. Carbonate is opaque.
SAPPHIRE White, blue, violet. RUBY. Pink, red, violet-red. TOPAZ (oriental). Yellow. AMETHYST (oriental). Purple, violet. EMERALD (oriental). Green, generally pale.	9	Vitreous; very lively.	Transparent.
CHRYSOBERYL or ORIENTAL CHRYSOLITE. Bright pale-green, greenish-yellow, reddish-brown. ALEXANDRITE, when showing a reddish, translucent light. CYMOPHANE or CHRYSOBERYL CAT'S EYE, when opalescent.	8.5	Vitreous; sometimes pearly.	Transparent and semi-transparent.
SPINELLE. Dark-red, white, blue, green PLEONASTE or CEYLANITE. Black. RUBICELLE. Orange. BALAS RUBY. Rose-red.	8	Vitreous.	Transparent. Translucent.
TOPAZ. White, greenish, yellow, orange, cinnamon, bluish, pink.	8	Vitreous.	Transparent. Translucent.
EMERALD. Fine green. BERYL or AQUAMARINE. Pale sea-green, blue, yellow, white, rarely pink.	7.5 to 8	Vitreous.	Transparent.
HYACINTH or JACINTH. Brownish-yellow, brownish-red, cinnamon. JARGOON. Various shades of green, yellow, white and brown.	7.5	Vitreous; almost adamantine.	Transparent to opaque.
GARNET. ALMANDINE. Violet-red. CARBUNCLE. Red, brownish. CINNAMON STONE. White, yellow-orange, cinnamon. PYROPE. Vermilion or Bohemian garnet.	6.5 to 7.5	Vitreous, inclining to resinous.	Transparent to opaque.

Specific Gravity.	Refractive Index.	Dispersive Power.	Composition.
3.4 to 3.6	2.455 to 2.487	0.38	Pure carbon.
3.9 to 4.2	1.765	0.026	Alumina, 98.5 Iron oxide, 1.0 Lime, 0.5
3. to 3.8	1.760	0.033	Alumina, 80.2 Glucina, 19.8 (Traces of iron, lead and copper oxides.)
3.8	1.755 to 1.810	0.040	Alumina, 69.01 Magnesia, 26.21 Silica, 2.02 Iron oxide, 0.71 Chromium oxide, 1.10
3.5 to 3.6	1.635	0.025	Silica, 34.01 Alumina, 58.38 Fluorine, 15.06 (Traces of metal oxides.)
2.67 to 2.75	1.585	0.026	Silica, 68.50 Alumina, 15.75 Glucina, 12.50 Iron oxide, 1.00 Lime, 0.25
4.07 to 4.70	1.990	0.044	Zirconia, 66.80 Silica, 33.00 Iron oxide, 0.10
3.5 to 4.3	1.759	0.033	Silica, 38.25 Lime, 31.75 Alumina, 19.35 Iron oxide, 7.33 Magnesia, 2.40 Manganese oxide, 0.50

Name and Color.	Hardness.	Lustre.	Diaphaneity.
TOURMALINE. Green, red, brown, yellow, blue, black, white.	7. to 7.5	Vitreous.	Transparent to opaque.
QUARTZ or ROCK CRYSTAL. White. AMETHYST. Violet. CAIRNGORM. Yellow, brown. CHRYSOPHRASE. Fine apple-green. CAT'S EYE. Chatoyant. PLASMA. Deep olive-green. JASPER. Yellow, red, green, black, brown. BLOODSTONE. Dark-green with red spots. CARNELION. Red, white, yellow. AGATE. Various colors. ONYX. Having black, brown and white layers. SARDONYX. Having red or brownish-red and white layers. MOCHA-STONE. Dendritic.	7	Vitreous.	Transparent to nearly opaque.
CHRYSLITE. PERIDOT. Olive-green. OLIVINE.	6 to 7	Vitreous.	Transparent. Translucent.
TURQUOISE. Blue, green, white.	6	Vitreous.	Opaque, but translucent at edges.
OPAL. Red, white, green, gray, black, yellow (iridescent).	5.5 to 6.5	Vitreous, inclining to resinous.	Semi-transparent.
PEARL. White, yellow, pink, black, violet, brown, gray.	2.5 to 3.5	Pearly.	Opaque; sometimes semi-transparent.

Specific Gravity.	Refractive Index.	Dispersive Power.	Composition.
2.99 to 3.3	1.625	0.028	Silica, 38.85 Alumina, 31.32 Magnesia, 13.89 Boric acid, 8.25 Fluorine, 2.28 Lime, 1.60 Iron oxide, 1.27 Soda, 1.28 Potash, 0.26
2.65	1.549	0.026	Silica, 99.37 Alumina, 0.63 AMETHYST. Silica, 97.50 Alumina, 0.50 Iron oxide, 1.50 Manganese oxide, 0.50
3.3 to 3.44	1.660	0.033	Magnesia, 50.14 Silica, 39.73 Iron oxide, 9.19 Nickel oxide, 0.32 Alumina, 0.22 Manganese oxide, 0.09
2.62 to 3.	?	?	Alumina, 47.45 Phosphoric acid, 27.34 Calcium phos., 3.41 Copper oxide, 2.05 Iron oxide, 1.10 Manganese oxide, 0.50 Water, 18.18
2. to 2.3	?	?	Silica, 91.32 Water, 8.68 (Traces of coloring matter.)
2.5 to 2.7	None.	None.	Carbonate of lime and organic matter.

on an average, were employed in the far-famed mines of Golconda, and a single sovereign, Sultan Mahmoud, amassed during his reign of thirty-two years, 400 pounds weight of this precious stone, but to-day the supply from that region seems to be nearly if not quite exhausted. In the early part of the eighteenth century diamonds were discovered in Brazil, and the output was enormous, but the discovery proved a curse to the inhabitants; for, as soon as the home government learned of the valuable treasures, it expelled the rightful owners from their lands, declared the diamond-trade a monopoly, and itself the exclusive proprietor. Not till some seventy-five years later was a sad remnant of the descendants of those exiles allowed to regain a part of their rightful possessions, but in the meantime the yield had begun to fail, and at the present date it is relatively insignificant. Diamonds are known to exist in Russia, but the search has not been systematic, and the yield is small. Borneo has about dropped out of the list of diamond-producing countries, and Australia does not seem to have fulfilled the hopes of a few years ago. The United States, Mexico, and Canada have each furnished a few diamonds, just enough to show that there may be more where those came from, but not enough to interfere with the markets elsewhere. At the present day the diamond fields of the world are those of South Africa, which supply 95 per cent. of all the diamonds that are being put on the markets of the world just now. Since their discovery in 1867, they have yielded nearly ten tons of diamonds, and that is more than the yield of the rest of the world for the past two centuries. They have been valued in the rough at \$300,000,000, and after cutting, at more than double that sum.

SOME REMARKABLE DIAMONDS.

The Braganza.—The Braganza forms part of the crown-jewels of Portugal. It was found in Brazil by a slave in 1741. It is said to weigh 1880 carats, or nearly 16 ounces Troy, and has been estimated on paper to be worth \$275,000,000, but grave doubts are entertained as to its genuineness, and as the Portuguese government absolutely refuses to allow it to be examined, no trustworthy estimate of its value can be made, and the doubts have become, in the minds of mineralogists, almost a certainty. They now generally suspect it to be simply a colorless Topaz.

The Muttam.—This gem was found in Borneo in 1760, and weighs 367 carats, or a little over 3 ounces. It was once the cause of a sanguinary war, but the Rajah of Mattam stuck to his diamond through thick and thin, and his successor holds it yet. The Dutch Governor of Batavia offered him two gunboats, all armored and provisioned, and a sum of \$250,000 for it, but the Rajah refused saying that the fortunes of his family depended on its possession.

The Koh-I-Noor (Mountain of Light).—When it was that this gem first came to the light of upper day is not known. The Hindoos claim that it was already in their possession way back in the fabulous times of their god, Krischna. Taking this yarn as a starting point, more square-yards of lies have been told about this stone than would paper Münch-

hausen's front parlor. One account tells how it was turned up by a peasant in plowing, and traces its wanderings, almost year by year, ever since. This is clear and satisfactory, until somebody else strikes in, and relates how it was *first* discovered in the mines of Golconda, some three centuries later. And then, as if it were not enough to expect us to swallow all that, some one else tries his hand at inventing, and assures us, without a particle of evidence to back him up, that it was *originally* found forty miles from Golconda, in a cave. Next, one authority says it weighed when rough, over 800 carats, another puts it 793 just, another at 186. One says it was cut down to 284, and subsequently to 180 carats, another says 186, another 106, and still another 102½. Some call it a Brilliant, some a Rose. It has been traced from hand to hand, the transitions being generally effected by a big breach in the Seventh Commandment, till at last the historian, in all innocence, tell us that it "fell into the hands of the British soldiers" at Lahore in 1849. After this last "discovery" it was of course, presented to "Victoria, by the grace of God, etc." It is valued at \$10,000,000.

The Orloff.—The Orloff weighs 194½ carats. It is supposed to have formed one of the eyes of an idol in a Brahmanic temple, or to have been set in the throne of Nadir Shah. Be that as it may, it was certainly obtained from the East by theft, and sold in Malabar for \$14,000. The Empress Catherine II. of Russia, bought it in 1724 for about \$450,000 and an annuity of \$20,000, and a title of *nobility*. It is a perfect gem in every respect, and measures 1¼ inches in diameter, and nearly 1 inch in thickness, and is valued to-day even higher than the price which Catherine paid. It still belongs to the crown of Russia.

The Regent or Pitt.—Pitt, when Governor of Fort St. George, in Sumatra, in 1717, sold a diamond to the Regent of France, for \$675,000. He was accused of having stolen it from a poor Indian who had found it, and was lampooned by Pope unceremoniously, but wrote a pamphlet to prove his innocence, and of course succeeded in doing so. Anyhow, it weighed 410 carats in the rough, but was reduced to 136¾ in the cutting, which operation took two years of labor and cost \$17,500. It is absolutely faultless, and was valued by the Commission of Jewelers at Paris, in 1791, at \$2,500,000. The Emperor Napoleon I. wore it in the pommel of his sword.

The Sancy.—The Sancy is a beautiful stone, of a pear-shape, cut as a Rose both on the top and on the bottom (double-rose), and weighs 56½ carats. It cost originally \$600,000, but was afterwards sold for more than double that sum. Where it came from is not known. It first appears on the scene in the possession of Charles the Bold, who lost it in the battle of Granson, 1477. It was found by a Swiss who sold it for about 50 cents to a priest who, on re-selling it, raised the price to 75 cents. It was then lost sight of for more than 100 years, when it turned up in the hands of a king of Portugal, who sold it to the Baron de Sancy, from whom it received the name which it has retained. Sancy was Treasurer of the King, and Henry III. borrowed it, and sent it as a pledge to the Swiss government, but the messenger was mur-

dered on the way. For a long time nothing further was heard of the diamond, till at last it was learned that the faithful servant, rather than give it up had swallowed it. His grave was found, and the gem recovered and restored to its owner. Sancy next disposed of it to James II. of England, who in turn sold it to Louis XIV. for \$125,000. During the French Revolution it was stolen, together with other gems to the value of several millions, very few of which were ever recovered. The Sancy however was found again by the police of the Champs Elysées, through an anonymous letter. Finally, Napoleon I. bought it and afterwards re-sold it to Prince Paul Demidoff of Russia, in which country it has since rested from its journeyings.

The Blue Diamond.—This diamond belonged to the crown-jewels of France, but was stolen at the same time as the Sancy. It was never recovered. There is a rumor however that it was sold in 1835 by an agent of the Bourbons to the Emperor of Russia for \$250,000, though it was valued in its day at \$600,000. It was, or is, a magnificent stone, of a rich and rare sky-blue color. We have no record of its weight.

The Star of the South.—This is a Brazilian diamond, found by a negress in July 1853. It weighed in the rough, 254½ carats, but the cutting reduced it to 125. Though not perfectly pure it is one of the finest diamonds extant. It is owned by the renowned gem-cutter, Coster of Amsterdam.

CROWN JEWELS.

The crown of Ivan Alexiowitch, of Russia, contained 881 diamonds, all brilliants; that of Peter the Great 847; that of Catherine 2536, and immense numbers have been added since her day to the crown-jewels of Russia.

The crown-jewels of France, before the great theft in 1792, were estimated at over \$5,000,000, more than half of which were diamonds.

Nizam, king of Golconda, had a diamond valued at \$1,000,000, and which weighed 340 carats.

The Queen of England, at her coronation, June 28, 1838, wore a crown weighing a little over three pounds, adorned with about 400 diamonds, the total value of the crown being about \$555,000. The historian of the event makes a remark which sounds funny enough now: "In the front of the Maltese cross which is in front of the crown is the enormous heart-shaped ruby once worn by the chivalrous Edward the Black Prince, but now destined to adorn the head of a virgin queen."

Other sovereigns of Europe and elsewhere have, of course, jewels in their crowns, befitting their dignity, but we have not the time or space to enumerate them here.

Since writing the above, we have come across a description, in the *Catholic Standard*, of March 16, 1895, of several of the diamonds just mentioned. The account agrees substantially with our own, but the *Standard* adds a new and remarkable piece of information well worth repeating. It is to the effect that a magnificent diamond has lately been discovered in the Transvaal Republic, in South Africa. It weighs 971¾ carats, and is of a bluish-white color, and, but for one black spot in the

centre, is practically perfect. The finder was rewarded with a present of \$750 and a horse and saddle. The first estimate places its value at \$1,000,000, and the President of the little Republic has made a present of it to Pope Leo XIII.

THE UNITED STATES.

It is refreshing to find one thing in this, our beloved land, in which we cannot, and do not, claim to beat the universe, earth, planets and all. That one thing is the production of diamonds. The total value of all found here during the last fifteen years does not probably reach \$1000. To make up for this we have, according to Kuntz, imported quite heavily especially in recent years. Thus since 1868 there have passed through our Custom House, diamonds to the value of \$120,000,000, three-quarters of which were entered during the last twelve years. From 3 to 4 per cent. of them were in the rough state, but of those entered as "cut" a very large proportion were for re-cutting, a job which we flatter ourselves we are able to do to a nicety, and a little better than the rest of the world.

Although we have no crown-jewels, yet some of our "uncrowned kings" own gems as of great intrinsic value as are those of many a king or emperor. When in 1886 the crown-jewels of France were sold, not of course for the sake of the filthy lucre, but merely because there was found no head on which the crown of a Charlemagne could fit, about one-third of them (including four of the famous "Mazarins") came to the United States. We paid for that lot over \$500,000, and it was dirt cheap. There are now ear-rings in the country worth from \$5000 to \$8000 a pair, and necklaces which are valued at from \$100,000 to over \$300,000 each, and other things in proportion. One Bishop has a mitre worth, principally on account of its jewels, \$30,000. Another has a chalice, valued for the same reason, at \$10,000. Another a pectoral cross estimated at \$5000, and the quantity of precious church regalia is steadily increasing.

In the first group of our list we have placed *bort and carbonate*. The former is merely such bits and fragments of diamond as are too small, or are for other reasons unfit, to be used as gems. They are ground up and used for polishing. The latter seems to be an imperfectly crystallized carbon. It is equally hard with the diamond, but being opaque, it is useless as a gem. It is powdered and employed for polishing.

There is also a Black Diamond which is even harder than the ordinary precious gem, and on that account it is preferred for the manufacture of diamond drills and other cutting instruments.

We had intended to give a brief account of nearly all the other gems mentioned in the Table, but space fails us, and so we are obliged to defer the project till another time.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S.J.

Book Notices.

REVEALED RELIGION; From the "Apologie des Christenthums" of Franz Hettinger, D.D., Professor of Theology at the University of Wurzburg. Edited with an Introduction on the Assent of Faith. By *Henry Sebastian Bowden*, of the Oratory. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 225. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Pu-tet & Co.

Doctor Hettinger's great work "*Apologie des Christenthums*" has long since procured for him a position in the front rank of Catholic theologians. It has been translated into nearly every European language, and the first volume of the English translation, entitled, "*Natural Religion*," which appeared in 1892, has already reached a second edition. Now we have the second volume entitled, "*Revealed Religion*." Father Bowden of the Oratory, who makes the translation is familiar with Doctor Hettinger's text, for in 1885 he gave to the English speaking world, a translation of the same author's great work on Dante, of which a second edition was published last year.

The volume before us begins with an Introduction by the translator on "*The Assent of Faith*." The work proper is divided into seven chapters treating of the "*Possibility of Revelation*," the "*Necessity of Revelation*," "*Miracles and Prophecy*," the "*Credibility of the Gospels*," the "*Divinity of Christ*," "*Prophecy and Fulfilment*," and "*Christ and Christianity*." There is an appendix dealing with "*The Tübingen Theory*," and there is also an Index.

From the Preface to the book we gather the following explanation and summary of its contents:

"The claims of Christianity are to be tested, according to the modern scientific method, like those of any human creed. Its origin must be sought in the ideas, political, philosophical, religious, current at its birth, and their influence, on the mind of its founder. Its moral worth will be determined by its agreement with the conclusions of reason, and its power of satisfying the higher needs of mankind. Thus, religion is treated like a philosophy or a language, as merely the product of human thought, and the notion of Revelation is set aside. Now reason may indeed reject a creed as worthless, if its doctrines, though professedly revealed, are manifestly absurd and licentious, as are those of Mahomedanism. But where the morality is undoubtedly pure, as is the case with Christianity, the only logical mode of inquiry is to examine, not the nature of the doctrines, in themselves professedly incomprehensible, but the external evidence for the fact that those doctrines are a revelation from God. Such is the method pursued by the earlier Christian apologists, and adopted in the present volume." Revelation presupposes the existence of God. The evidence for this fundamental truth appears in the first volume of Doctor Hettinger's work, entitled "*Natural Religion*." Revealed religion is founded on faith, as natural religion is founded on reason, and since this term is variously understood, the editor in the Introduction treats of its precise theological sense, and the nature and motive of the assent which it requires.

"A revelation, however, could never claim acceptance unless it showed external signs of its authenticity, and this evidence is found in the visible, supernatural facts of miracles and prophecies. The characteristics

of such phenomena have then to be fully considered, and their possibility demonstrated from the existence of an omnipotent Creator. Now comes the turning-point of the whole inquiry. Have these facts ever occurred, or, in other words, are the Gospels credible?" They are. It is shown that the narrative of the Evangelists is an accurate historical account of facts that really occurred; that is supported by the testimony of trustworthy contemporary witnesses, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; and that must be admitted as true if we wish to account for the foundation of Christianity. This evidence has been attacked most fiercely by the followers of the rationalistic school of the University of Tübingen in Würtemberg, led by F. C. Bauer. They are answered by Rev. H. Cator of the Oratory in the Appendix.

"But as regards miracles, saints in all times have worked them; what was then peculiar to Christ's? The saints wrought miracles in the power of God, and to approve themselves His messengers; Christ worked miracles in His own power and to attest His own divinity; and the last miracle of His earthly life, His Resurrection, was the crowning proof of His claim to be the Son of God. Hence the miracles of Christ, and especially His Resurrection, require to be examined from this point of view. For the same reason, the proof from prophecy has to be separately considered, for the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ furnishes even stronger evidence than the miracles that He alone was the Messiah, the God-man foretold. And again, the accomplishment in His Church of the predictions which He Himself made of His future kingdom testifies to His divinity with increasing force, as each successive age witnesses their fulfilment." The rationalists try to explain the rise and spread of Christianity by merely human causes, and they point to Mahomedanism and Buddhism in proof of their contention. Dr. Hettinger disposes of those gentlemen very successfully and very quickly.

"The leading objections against Christianity have been the same in all time, and Dr. Hettinger, in dealing with them, naturally takes the Fathers and Schoolmen for his guides. These objections fall always under two chief heads. The rationalists, like the Jews, deny the fact of Revelation; the skeptics, like the Gentiles, its possibility." The moderns have added nothing to the arguments of the ancients, and in many instances they use the very same words. This is illustrated in the assertion that the Resurrection was the mere invention of a deluded woman. The words of Origen are still applicable: "The incredible character of such assertions palpably betrays their falsehood." The letters of the Mahatmas are accepted as authentic, while the Epistles of St. Paul are rejected as spurious. Any conjecture, no matter how uncritical, wild, or irrational, if it be anti-Christian, is accepted as fact, while Christian facts are rejected as conjectures.

We have an illustration of this in the "scientific" explanation which Bauer, the founder of the Tübingen school, makes of the formation of the Christian Gospels. He says that they were forged late in the second century, apparently by apostolic authority, to bring about the reconciliation of the rival parties led by Peter and Paul, which, until then, had divided the Christian Body.

Now this is a mere assumption, supported by no evidence and contradicted by a successive chain of witnesses from Clement to Irenæus.

This sameness in the objections against Christianity is emphasised when we notice that, so far from aiding the skeptics, every true advance in Biblical learning made in this century, such as Tatian's "*Diatessa-*

ron," the "Apology" of Aristides, and the "Epitaph" of St. Abercius, corroborates, directly or indirectly, the traditional authority of the Gospels, and the unbroken, continuous unity of the Christian Church. A striking illustration of the rash manner in which the enemies of Christianity assert, deny, and assume, in the same breath, is furnished by their treatment of the "Diatessaron," a document which shows the supreme and exclusive authority enjoyed by the Gospels, four in number, at the time of its composition, about A.D. 150, or within fifty years of the date of St. John's Gospel. In 1875, Mr. Bauer disposed of this troublesome document by saying, "it seems never to have been seen, probably for the simple reason that there was no such work." Now, that ought to end all discussion of the matter; but, unfortunately for Mr. Bauer, in 1888, an Arabic version of the "Diatessaron" containing the four Gospels, including St. John's, in their entirety, with the exception of the genealogies, was brought to light in the Vatican library by Father Ciasca, and published with his Latin translation. This might have silenced a more modest man, but the oracle of the Tübingen school hardly excels in that virtue. He returns to the attack undaunted. "Without any apology for the groundlessness of his previous assertion, and with a happy contempt for facts and evidence, he finds traces, invisible to others, of an apocryphal gospel, the Pseudo-Peter, in the work before him, and declares that it ought to have been called the 'Diapente.' Thus, now that the document declared by him as probably non-existent is discovered, he asserts that it is not what it calls itself, and that he knows more about it than the author himself; and this audacity succeeds; not, indeed, with any competent judge, but with the public at large. Like the twice-slain hero of a melodrama, our critic returns sound and scathless at the end of the piece to receive the popular applause."

It must not be supposed that the author of this work discusses all objections against Christianity in particular. No defence can do that, because anti-Christian hypotheses are multitudinous, and for the most part ephemeral, for they are born and die within an hour, while many of them are mutually destructive. "Since 1850, there have been published 747 theories regarding the Old and the New Testament, of which 608 are now defunct. The aim of the present volume, then, has been to bring clearly to the front the leading principles of Christianity and skepticism, as the most valid and effective method of inquiry into the whole subject, and of elucidating the truth."

In doing this, the author follows the traditional methods of defence, and for this reason his work will not please those who belong to the modern school of Biblical criticism. They assume two principles as certain: first, that scholastic theology is no longer a serviceable weapon; and secondly, that it is their task to recast Catholic truth in one or other form of modern thought.

But this new school of apologists has not produced good results. Its more conspicuous members have many times committed themselves to untenable positions, and have, more than once, incurred the condemnation of the Church. The real result, then, of their labors has been the production of hybrid doctrines, condemned by the Church, and rejected by the non-Catholic schools, which they were intended to conciliate. The reason is plain. The contempt of these writers for theology proper led them to neglect the study of it, while their admiration for non-Catholic systems blinded them to the fundamental errors on which these systems are based.

"It cannot be denied that the scientific defence of Christian truth,

like everything finite, admits of improvement ; that different times require different treatment. . . . But it must also be remembered that, while the Church may change the form of her defence, as St. Peter used one set of arguments with the Jews, and St. Paul another with the Gentiles, her doctrines themselves are necessarily and always immutable. As she did not create the faith, neither can she change it. She teaches what she has heard ; she ordains what she has been told. She cannot modify one doctrine, or tamper with the exactness of its expression, even though by so doing she would win half the world. Her mission is to convert the nations to the truth, not to adapt the truth to them, and every attempt to do so must be fatal alike to the cause of truth and to the souls it is designed to save."

Now, although there are many systems for the exposition and defence of Catholic truth, and though they all have some good in them, there is only one system that has been specially commended by the Church in the past, and is unreservedly sanctioned in the present, and that is the scholastic method, but particularly the teaching of St. Thomas.

"The Summa is far more than Aristotle Christianized. It is the whole circle of revealed truth defined, defended and illustrated ; and the marvellous penetration, grasp and accuracy of the Angelic Doctor are attested by the many cases in which his conclusions have anticipated doctrinal decisions and refuted future heresies. For six centuries it has held a place absolutely unrivalled in the councils of the Church and in her theological schools. While, on the other hand, 'ever since its rise,' says Melchoir Canus, 'contempt of scholasticism and the pest of heresies have gone hand in hand.' Wycliff, Luther, Melancthon, the Jansenists, each in turn reviled the schoolmen, as do now the admirers of Hegel and Kant."

Dr. Hettinger follows this scholastic method, which has stood the test of time, incurred the hatred of heretics and merited the approval of the Church. But he is more than a safe teacher. He is interesting, clear and comprehensive. The book should do an immense amount of good, particularly in the hands of Catholic laymen, who are so frequently attacked on the subjects of which it treats. But its usefulness is by no means limited to Catholics. It will prove a good weapon of defence in the hands of all earnest Christians.

SOCIAL EVOLUTION. By *Benjamin Kidd*. McMillan & Co.; New York. Price 25 cents.

The attitude of the Catholic Church towards the theories of Evolution, Natural Selection, and the Survival of the Fittest, has generally been unfavorably criticised by the scientific world, and by that larger public which is inclined to regard the Church as opposed to all progress. Catholic writers, from St. Augustine¹ onward (as President White, of Cornell University, has recently pointed out in his chapters on "The Warfare of Science") have had glimpses of the ideas embraced under the general term Evolution. But, since it has been propounded as a system, the great writers and teachers of the Church have preferred to await further developments before accepting theories which, when enunciated, were regarded by their supporters as likely to create a permanent breach between science and religion.

¹ St. Augustine suggests the adoption of the old evolution or emanation theory, dwells on a potential creation, as involved in the actual creation, and speaks of animals "whose numbers the aftertime unfolded" "New Chapters on the Warfare of Science," *Popular Science Monthly*, August, 1894.

Now, however, a new era has dawned with the rise of the modern school of evolutionists, of whom Mr. Kidd is one.

In the introduction to his "Social Evolution," the work under consideration, in speaking of religion, he says: "The time is certainly not far distant when science must look back with surprise, if not, indeed, with some degree of shamefacedness, to the attitude in which she has for so long addressed herself to one of the highest problems in the history of life."

Mr. Kidd's book is not as well known as it ought to be among Catholics. The author is, in fact, still a young man, only thirty-five years of age. He is an ardent Protestant (strangely ignorant, indeed, of the fundamental principles of the Catholic Church), and is regarded by his antagonists in England as an advanced socialist.

The work divides itself, apparently without Mr. Kidd's intention, into two distinct parts. In the first, he attempts to define the moral, and even the ethical, value of the theories based on Professor Weismann's physiological discovery of "*unalterable cells*." This portion of the work is beyond the scope of this article, but we will attempt to state Mr. Kidd's position as simply as possible. In his opinion, the "unalterable cells" are not only the evidence of design in creation, they are, also, the source of what he regards as the "supernatural" principle which is "opposed to reason"—of that spirit which is the only motive power of moral progress in the past, the only hope of humanity in the future.¹ It would appear to many of us that Mr. Kidd, in applying this theory, attempts to prove too much; but, even if his conclusions are only half-truths, in science they do not invalidate the ethical importance of the second part of his work.

In this, he uses various scientific and historical arguments to show the development in the past of the moral sense, as superior to reason, and to prove the evolution and ultimate triumph of the principle which "makes for righteousness," which we call the spirit of Christianity, and Mr. Kidd terms Altruism.

This idea is familiar to every Catholic child who has studied his catechism, but, until Mr. Herbert Spencer's "Date of Ethics," the term was not scientifically used, and it has never before been stated as a controlling factor in the science of Evolution. There is some ground, perhaps, for the comment in the article (said to be by the Duke of Argyll) on this work in the *Edinburgh Review*, for January, 1894, which speaks of "Altruism—this being the new and very affected name for the old familiar things which we used to call charity, benevolence, and love." But we acknowledge a debt of gratitude to Mr. Kidd, for his efforts to bring evolutionary science into line with what Carlyle calls the "eternal verities," and pardon him for using a terminology which does not, at least to Catholics, materially obscure his meaning.

His book begins with a review of the condition of humanity at the end of the present century, and of the spirit of restlessness and discontent which are its characteristics, as exemplified in the works of Prof. Huxley and others. But Mr. Kidd regards these views as the expression of a phase of thought which is passing away. "To the mind," he says, "which can rise above the pessimism of the later half of the nineteenth century, the twentieth has begun to dawn. . . . The air is full

¹ Those who care to do so, will be repaid for reading Professor Weismann's recent works, and the still more recent controversy between Mr. Herbert Spencer and himself in the *Contemporary Review*. In fact, all the great Reviews have had articles on this controversy within the past year, showing the great importance which is attached to the theories of Professor Weismann.

of new battle-cries, of the sound of the gathering and marshalling of new forces, and of the reorganization of old ones." The book is filled with the spirit of hopefulness, which gives it a rare charm. Even to Catholics, whose faith is as a beacon on a rock, life of late has been saddened by the sound of the waves of unbelief and discontent beating about its foundations; while those outside the Church, who have done most to form the ideas of the present generation, are discouraged by the ideals which they have themselves created.

For the various lines of argument by which Mr. Kidd supports his optimistic views of the future of humanity, the reader is referred to his book; but it must be remarked that, in the chapter on the Current Definitions of Religion, not a single definition from the Catholic standpoint is included. Perhaps the fact that a whole world of thought is thus ignored, accounts for the inadequacy of the treatment to the subject.

Mr. Kidd's chapters on Western Civilization contain the most sympathetic exposition of the development of that civilization which is possible for one who does not possess the faith which is the key to that development. "The early centuries of our era," observes the author, "possess the deepest interest for the scientific mind." "The old religions," he quotes from Froude, speaking of Cæsar's time, "were dead, from the Pillars of Hercules to the Euphrates and the Nile, and the principles upon which human society has been constructed were dead also." The new forces which were born into the world with the Christian religion were evidently, from the first, of immeasurable social significance. "There sprang from Christianity," observes Lecky,¹ "an aggressive and, at the same time, disciplined enthusiasm, wholly unlike any other which has been witnessed on earth. The Christian religion possessed, from the outset, two characteristics destined to render it an evolutionary force of the first magnitude. The first was the extraordinary strength of the ultra rational sanction it provided. The second was the nature of the ethical system associated with it."

Mr. Kidd considers, in rapid review, the Christian persecutions; the "extraordinary epidemic of asceticism" which overran the world, of which he says: "many writers of philosophical insight still altogether misunderstand the significance of this movement"; the development of Western Europe into a "vast theocracy"; the gradual disappearance of the ideal of the Holy Roman Empire; the extinction of the principle of caste; the progress towards individual liberty.

The parallel development of Christianity and civilization through these forces is traced to the period of the Renaissance, "the great watershed which divides the modern world from the old," and to the Reformation, of which Mr. Kidd remarks, in this place, "to the evolutionist this movement is essentially a social development."

Since that period, the abolition of slavery, the extinction of feudalism, the progressive legislation towards universal suffrage, and the "revolt of labor," are enumerated by Mr. Kidd as triumphs of the altruistic spirit. The characteristics of the present period of western civilization he believes to be intense individualism and altruistic enthusiasm.

His views on Socialism, interesting as they are—for he invests them with ethical significance—cannot be considered in this article. From his facts and theories, Mr. Kidd derives the conclusion that "the evolution which is slowly proceeding in human society does not tend

¹ Lecky's *History of European Morals*, p. 490.

towards Socialism, but towards the elevation to the highest power of individualism, through the principle of altruism."

So far, the conclusions which Mr. Kidd draws from his premises run in parallel lines with those accepted by the Catholic Church. It is, however, impossible for its members to accede to his views as to the results of the so-called Reformation. In support of his own opinion, he quotes Prof. Marshall, who states, in his *Theory of Economics* that "the doctrines of the Reformation deepened the character of the English people, reacted on their habits of life, and gave a tone to their industries. Family life was so intensified that the family life of those races which have adopted the reformed religion are the fullest and richest in earthly feeling."

Surely history contradicts the statement of Prof. Marshall, that at the period of the Reformation, "*for the first time* large numbers of rude and uncultivated people yearned towards the mysteries of absolute spiritual freedom." Has he forgotten the wonder expressed, even by non-Catholic historians, at the rapid evangelization of the masses by the Church from the apostolic age onward?

"The softening and deepening of character" which was accomplished, according to Mr. Kidd, by the Reformation "was accompanied by a release into our lives of an immense and all pervading fund of altruistic feeling which has provided the motive force behind the whole onward movement with which our age is identified." But Catholics do not admit this. Leaving aside the history of the Church in the past, what evidence have we among Protestants to-day of such self-sacrifice as Father Damien's, such heroism as that of the Martyrs in China? Noble and public spirited as they often are, have Protestants ever emulated the "all pervading altruism" of our religious orders, or even the lives of perpetual self-denial of our parish priests? How can the family life be "fullest and freest" in forms of religion which admit, if they do not sanction divorce?

The anarchistic spirit which is the terror of every government in Europe had no existence where the monastic orders mediated between the rich and the poor, and many thinkers look forward to even a partial adoption of the views expressed in the Labor Encyclical of the present Pope as the only possible *modus vivendi* between Labor and Capital. The bond of charity which it inculcates would, no doubt, lead to the triumph of the altruistic spirit, while the philanthropy of Protestantism seeks to remove evils because they are an injury to the body politic, rather than for the sake of the individual.

The conclusions which Mr. Kidd draws from the data which he has collected seem to us singularly inadequate. The future which he predicts, and about which he is so hopeful, is based entirely on the ultimate supremacy of the English-speaking races, inspired by Protestantism, with the New Democracy as their gospel. Students of history will scarcely admit that the altruistic method has been adopted hitherto by England in her acquisition and government of territory and population. The Report of the Royal Commission on the Present Condition of Labor in Great Britain would indicate that if Protestantism gave a tone to her industries, it was a lamentably low one; while it does not appear that the New Demos carries the olive branch of altruistic peace into the present conflicts between Labor and Capital.

We cannot, therefore, accept Mr. Kidd's conclusions, but we are, nevertheless, grateful to him for a work which is thoughtful and suggestive, a mass of information which is valuable to every reader, a disciplined hopefulness, and a reverent interpretation of the mysteries of

science. We only regret his want of knowledge or appreciation of the Catholic Church, for we believe that she, who in the past has done more for social morality than any religion on earth, is destined to carry to its ultimate development that spirit of Christ which the philosophers of to-day call Altruism.

AGNOSTICISM AND RELIGION. Being an Examination of Spencer's Religion of the Unknowable, preceded by a History of Agnosticism. Dissertation for the Doctorate in Theology at the Catholic University of America. By *Rev. George J. Lucas*. Cloth, 8vo., pp. 136. Baltimore; John Murphy & Co. 1895.

It is, indeed, most fitting that the first candidate for the degree of Doctor of Divinity at the Catholic University of America should choose for the subject of his dissertation "Agnosticism and Religion." A superficial observer of events might think some other subject more appropriate. He might be tempted to assert that the student of the Catholic University should devote his time and energy to the defence of the Church as the agent of an Incarnate God. But such an assertion would not be wise, because, at the present time, men are not attacking Christ, His Divinity, or the authority of His Church, but they are attacking God Himself. Why should a man busy himself building up an elaborate superstructure upon a foundation which his enemies are striving, by every means in their power, to destroy. He must first look to the foundation, and make it firm beyond question, before he builds higher. So the wise student does not strive to prove the Divinity of Christ and the authority of His Church while the world is denying, either directly or by implication, even the existence of God. Such is the deplorable state of affairs at the present time.

Physical science has made such rapid strides in recent years, and has wrought such wonderful changes, that men have forgotten its province and its limitations. Every new discovery brings about again the comparison between science and religion, and while it is true that the great majority of scientific men believe that religion is not injured but benefited by evolution, yet there are some scientists who claim that evolution destroys God. This doctrine is preached here and in Europe, has become the common creed at universities of both continents, is spread over the pages of the leading magazines of the world, and is borne into the houses of the people in general on the wings of the daily newspaper. An eminent writer tells us that in the universities of England this creed predominates among the undergraduates and the younger dons, and we venture to say that if some one should sound the minds of the young students of our own universities whose brains are running to hair, he would find that they can talk more learnedly about Herbert Spencer and the Unknowable, than about any other subject except football. We have recently heard of a young gentleman, age thirteen, who, when asked to say the Apostle's Creed by his mother, informed her that he couldn't, because he didn't believe in the Resurrection of the Body.

It is so much more easy to say that a thing is unknowable than to try to know it. This is particularly true of metaphysical and supernatural subjects, although we do not see why the term might not be applied to all sorts of troublesome things.

Doctor Lucas sees this widespread atheistic and agnostic tendency, and, like a true doctor, he studies the subject. He finds that the fruits of this science are the extinction of all future hopes, of all true morality, of righteousness, and of the nobility of man's intellect. He

finds that this scientific anti-religionism embodies itself in Agnosticism, of which Messrs. Huxley, Tyndall, and Spencer are the apostles, and that of these three Mr. Spencer is the acknowledged leader. Indeed, it can be truthfully said that this gentleman is the personification of Religious Agnosticism. To him, then, Dr. Lucas finally turns his attention.

It is difficult to get these gentlemen to make a definite statement of their views, and to hold it for any time. Nothing is more characteristic of them than shifting and contradiction. They not only cut the ground away from under the feet of their colleagues and buffet them with contradictions, but as they take up their own stand on quicksands, they are constantly seeking new footing. The most complete and systematic expression of Religious Agnosticism is found in the first part of the first volume of Mr. Spencer's "Synthetic Philosophy," a work in ten volumes, and it is entitled "The Unknowable." To this work Dr. Lucas devotes his attention. He states the case in this way:

"The criticism of 'The Unknowable,' which we are about to enter on, will, in its main outlines, be simply this: a plain and sincere investigation of the Agnostic Metaphysic and Agnostic Science, and Religion for religious sovereignty. It will be simply this: Has Religious and Scientific Agnosticism brought valid reasons for the repudiation of the Living God, and the substitution of the Unknowable, Non-Living God in His stead? Or, on the contrary, is Agnosticism but a passing storm—a blast and blare of trumpets, summoning an army of mere spectral fancies against the philosophic and truly scientific phalanxes of good solid facts and good solid arguments which surround the inexpugnable fortress of the concept of a Personal God, and of its correlate, a Theistic Religion? This latter we maintain, and will endeavor to make good in our criticism of Mr. Spencer."

Every fair-minded reader who follows the author through the pages of this book will acknowledge, in the end, that he has succeeded in his undertaking. The first part of the work is devoted to "The History of the Rise of Agnosticism from Xenophanes to Spencer," and the second to "The Examination of Spencer's Religion of the Unknowable."

The book is worthy of the attention of all persons who are interested in the subject, but we must warn our readers that only a mind that has been trained in a scientific, philosophical, theological school can hope to understand it. We really think that one of the principal reasons why there are so many disciples of Huxley, Tyndall and Spencer is because so many silly, ignorant boys curiously pry into their teachings. Their minds cannot digest such food, and, mentally, they die of indigestion. Like moths, they hover near the flame until their wings are singed, and they are no longer able to rise in thought above the "Unknowable." We should feed such infants on the good, wholesome, easily-digested food of an act of faith. But to philosophers, theologians, scientists and students in general of mature mind we should say confidently, read Doctor Lucas's book.

HISTORY OF ST. PHILOMENA. Edited by *Charles Henry Bowdon*, Priest of the Oratory. 16mo, paper, pp. 320. London: Art and Book Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is a very interesting history of the finding of the body of the Saint, and the rapid growth of devotion to her. It is the work of an anonymous writer, but the greatest care has been taken to verify its statements by reference in most cases, and whenever possible to original sources. On the twenty-fourth of May, 1802, the excavators in the

catacomb of St. Priscilla, discovered a remarkable tombstone that had evidently never been disturbed since it had originally been placed there. When the authorized officials were summoned they found the tomb closed with three terra-cotta slabs on which were inscribed the words, "Pax Tecum Philomena," with the emblems of martyrdom. When the tomb was opened, they found the remains of a virgin and martyr who had been put to death at an early age; for it was evident from the size of the bones, particularly those of the head, that the child had received her crown probably when twelve or thirteen years old. Nothing is known of the life of the saint except what has been learned from private revelations, or what has been gathered from the deductions of the archæologist. The present history does not record private revelations, but we learn from De Rossi the archæologist of our own day, and from Bosio, who has been named the father of Christian archæology, that St. Philomena lived and died in the apostolic age; that is to say during the lifetime of those who received the faith from the apostles themselves, and therefore not later than the years 150 or 160 A.D.

The remains of the holy martyr and the broken phial still containing some of her congealed blood were removed to the treasury of sacred relics at Rome, where they remained till 1805. In that year they were transferred by permission of Pope Pius VII. to Mugnano, about five miles from Naples, where they have remained to the present day, and where a magnificent church has been erected in their honor. Pilgrims from all parts of the world visit this church every year and obtain through the intercession of St. Philomena great favors both temporal and eternal. Indeed, so frequent and wonderful are the miracles wrought by this saint, that she is called the miracle worker of the nineteenth century. She is known also as the playful saint, because of the nature of some of these miracles.

It is recorded that when the bishop to whom had been entrusted the reliquary containing the remains of the saint was about to leave Rome, he placed it in an obscure part of the vehicle which was used for transportation, although he had promised to carry it much more becomingly. The Saint reminded him of his promise and of his neglect by striking him several sharp blows, nor did she let him rest until he kept his word. In the scoffer this narration may excite laughter, but it is simply a question of fact, which has been verified and strengthened by many other like facts.

As the editor of this life very well says: "The marvels attributed to this Saint have been so manifold, and so notorious among the faithful, that it would be unreasonable to hesitate in giving credence to them. Extraordinary though they be, they are not isolated occurrences, but have been repeated over and over again in different countries and under various climes. They have taken place in presence of numbers of credible witnesses, have been attested by formal and trustworthy documents, and many of them have been subjected to minute episcopal investigation. The Church through her Supreme Head, has sanctioned the public worship of this Saint after mature deliberation; she has many times opened her sacred treasures and enriched it with spiritual favors and indulgences. It is thereby sufficiently recommended to Catholic piety as founded upon a solid basis and possessing every desirable guarantee."

In the year 1837 Pope Gregory XVI. issued a decree authorizing the public worship of St. Philomena; a Mass and Office were written in her honor, and although at first their use was restricted to the diocese of Nola, the bishops of many other dioceses soon sought and obtained per-

mission to use them. This is the only instance of a proper Mass and Office being granted in honor of a Saint from the catacombs, of whom nothing is known except her name and the fact of her martyrdom. Pope Pius IX. while Archbishop of Imola, was cured by this Saint, and introduced her devotion into his cathedral city. During his exile from Rome when he was Pope, he made a pilgrimage in person to her shrine. Pope Leo XIII., while apostolic administrator of the diocese of Benevento, made two pilgrimages to this holy shrine, and after he became Pope, sent a valuable cross from the Vatican Exposition to the rector of the church where the Saint lies.

Devotion to St. Philomena is not widespread in this country, but if this little history were read, we believe that it would grow rapidly. It may interest the readers of the *QUARTERLY* in Philadelphia, to know that there is an altar to St. Philomena in St. Mary's Church in this city.

LOYALTY TO CHURCH AND STATE. The Mind of His Excellency, Francis Archbishop Satolli, Apostolic Delegate. 12mo., cloth, pp. 250. Baltimore; Murphy & Co. 1895.

It will astonish those who have not observed closely the movements of His Excellency, the Most Rev. Francis Satolli, Archbishop of Lepanto, and Delegate Apostolic to the United States, to know that this handsome book of two hundred and fifty pages is filled with addresses and speeches made by him since his arrival in America: and it will astonish such persons yet more to know that the unpublished speeches of His Excellency would fill another volume equally large. Those who have met the Most Rev. Apostolic Delegate know that he is an humble modest man of retiring disposition. He does not wish his movements to be heralded throughout the land, nor does he seek opportunities to force his opinions on the people. Much that he does is unobserved, except by those in immediate contact with him; and much that he says, is unheard except by his immediate hearers. And yet, occupying the exalted position of Delegate Apostolic to the United States, and combining in himself the master philosopher, theologian, and sociologist, his opinions are of very great value.

The whole world listens attentively to the voice of the great Leo, and is astonished at his deep insight of men and governments in all their relations. The learned world bows down in admiration before that great philosopher and theologian, St. Thomas of Aquin. But Monsignor Satolli is the foremost student of the Angel of the Schools in the world to-day, and he has been the favorite pupil from childhood of the great Leo XIII.

We may rest assured that the Father sent to his children in America a child after his own heart, one familiar with his views of men and affairs, and one gifted like himself with a keen knowledge of minds and hearts. The utterances of such a man are worthy of the closest attention and of the deepest study. The Reverend Gentleman who has placed them within our reach is indeed deserving of our gratitude.

These addresses and speeches were delivered on various occasions, and embrace a variety of subjects. There are several on Christian Education, addressed to schools, colleges, and alumni associations, in which true education is clearly distinguished from false, and the necessity for moral and religious training is most convincingly shown. Nor does the Most Reverend Speaker on these occasions fail to show that the Church is not antagonistic to Public or State Schools, which are good enough as far as they go, but she knows the need of something better, and provides it. There is no conflict between Church and State on the

question of education. The Church says to the State: "What you are doing is good, and therefore I will do it, but I will add to it, what all thoughtful men, irrespective of creed, acknowledge is necessary to complete education."

One of the longest addresses in the collection is that made before the Carroll Institute, Washington, D. C., February 26, 1895, on "The Relations of Church and State." This is a delicate subject in the United States at the present time, and a dishonest or cowardly man would be afraid to approach it; but the Most Rev. Delegate Apostolic was glad of the opportunity to let the light of truth shine full on this great question, which so many wicked, narrow-minded, cowardly, bigoted men try so hard to befog; and the Monsignor knows so well how to clear away the clouds and let in the sunlight. He does not seek to flatter with sweet words, nor to mislead with many words, but in a straightforward, clear, concise manner, taking for his text the late encyclical of the Holy Father, he shows that the State has nothing to fear, but everything to hope, from the existence of the Catholic Church in her midst.

In addition to those that we have spoken of, there are addresses made on the occasions of jubilees and dedications; to clubs and societies; to congresses; on temperance; and on the training of youth.

They are all remarkable for clearness and conciseness. We recommend the book most strongly, especially to young men, and to those who are daily coming in contact with persons who misunderstand the mission of the Catholic Church in this country.

We may add that the book is edited by Very Rev. J. R. Slaterry, who has charge of the negro missions in this country, and that the profits derived from its sale will be devoted to the advancement of that noble work.

CONFERENCES ON THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By the *Rev. Père de Ravignan, S.J.* pp. 295, 12mo. London: R. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1895.

"The instructions comprised in this little book were addressed by the Rev. Père de Ravignan to the associates of the "Enfants de Marie," at the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Rue de Varennes, Paris, who were chiefly composed of ladies living in the world, who had formerly been educated under its roof. They were never written down by the reverend father, who, from motives of humility, had a great aversion to seeing his own words in black and white, but were compiled from notes taken during the discourses with secret, loving care by one of his hearers, and subsequently revised and edited in their due order by one to whom every shade of style, every turn of idea, and every habitual form of speech of the illustrious preacher of Notre Dame were familiar. Some of the chapters towards the conclusion of the volume, contain instructions given to religious only, during Lenten and other retreats." The preface to the French edition tells us so much of the history of the book.

It was first published in French in 1858. It was translated by Mrs. Abel Rain, and published in English with a preface by Rev. Father Gordan, of the London Oratory, in 1873. The fifth edition has just come from the press, and this proves that the author's words are living words.

There are twenty-one conferences on fundamental truths, on spiritual exercises, and on certain feasts. They all breathe simplicity and sanctity. The reader can imagine that the holy old man addresses him from the pages of the book, so well has the spirit of the speaker been preserved.

This book will furnish excellent spiritual reading, or material for meditation for any one, but especially for persons belonging to that class to which the instructions were first given. We think it will not be useful for those who intend to address such persons on like occasions, because the words of Father Ravignan would not fit in the mouth of any one except a man of like sanctity, and age, and eloquence. Such combinations are rare.

THE INNER LIFE OF FATHER THOMAS BURKE, O. P. By a Dominican Friar of the English Province. Cloth. 16mo. Pp. 100. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Bros.

The author of this little volume wishes "to put before his readers that side of Father Burke's character which, if it is least known, gives the truer, as well as the higher, idea of the well-known preacher of fifteen years ago."

A life of Father Burke was published within two years after his death; but it was taken up almost entirely with his public career. It did not place before us true pictures of the great preacher's childhood at Galway "full of fun and mischief"; of the young novice's life at Perugia, St. Sabina and Rome; or of the zealous Subdeacon and Prior laboring to resuscitate the struggling English Province. It did not show us the pious priest praying, meditating, and directing souls in the sacred tribunal of penance. But a life of Father Burke which did not picture him in all these characters would be incomplete, and, therefore, the author of the present little volume has taken up his pen. The book is small, brief—it can be read in an hour, and it has been penned by a loving hand. Father Burke's friends on both sides of the Atlantic will be glad to have it.

SYNOPSIS TRACTATUS SCHOLASTICI DE DEO UNO. Auctore, *Fernando Aloisio Stentrup, S. J.* Inspruck: Rauch Brothers. 1895.

This is a 360-page octavo treatise intended to be a text-book for the use of students of theology. The author, who is Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Inspruck, has already contributed to theological literature a work, "De Verbo Incarnato," in four volumes, two of which are entitled "Christologia" and two "Soteriologia." His experience must have made him familiar with the needs of student and teacher in the lecture room, and his treatise "De Deo Uno," is intended to supply their needs on that subject. Unlike many other authors, Father Stentrup adds to the usual chapters on the subject proper, a section treating "de creatione," "de conservatione," and "de concursu." The book is a storehouse of authorities skilfully brought together, and clearly and concisely explained.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

DIVINE LOVE AND THE LOVE OF GOD'S MOST BLESSED MOTHER. By *Right Rev. F. J. Weld*, Protonotary Apostolic. Received from Benziger Brothers.

A TOUR ROUND MY LIBRARY and Some Other Papers. By *B. B. Comegys* Philadelphia: Geo. S. Ferguson Co. 1893.

OUTLINES OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By *Sylvester Joseph Hunter, S. J.* Vol. I. New York: Benziger Brothers.

70752

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

